*Rectius Instruendum*

Or

A REVIEW and

# EXAMINATION

Of the doctrine presented by one assuming the Name of ane *Informer*, in three dialogues with a certain *Doubter*, upon the controverted points of *Episcopacy*, the *Covenants against Episcopacy*, and *Separation*.

*Wherein*

The unsoundnes, and (in many thinges) the inconsistency of the *Informers* principles, arguments, and answers, upon these points, the violence which he hath offred unto the holy scripture, and to diverse authors ancient and modern, is demonstrat and made appear. And that truth which is after godlines, owned by the true protestant Presbyterian Church of Scotland, asserted and vindicated.

*Prov* 19. 27 *Cease, myson, to hear the instruction that causeth to erre from the words of knowledge.*

Printed in the Year, 1684.

# THE PREFACE

## to the reader

*Christian reader*

THat which the wiseman long since offered to their consideration who observe the revolving course of providence, *is ther any thing wherof it may be said, this is new*, hath its signal accomplishment, in the renewed collisions of opinions and debeats. The conflicts betwixt truth and error or not of yesterday, but as early as the morning of time, when he who is a liar from the beginning assaulted with a horrid calumny the truth and faithfulnes of God, and having by a lie mad a breach in our first parents integrity, by inducing them to believe it, instilld his poison into our nature, *a love of darknes rather then light*. The eye of the understanding (like natures bodily organ when its cristalin humor is vitiat) cannot see and receive the impression of its object, (truth

and duty) in its lively colours and native ſimplicity; and if ſometimes the clear beames of truth force a paſſage for it ſelf, & make ſome impreſſion upon the perverſe & dark *mind of man*, O how quickly is that litle Victory loſt, this begun ſignature obliterat, by the rebellious *will & affections*. The carnal mind is not ſubject to the Law of God nor can be, hence truth is detaind in unrightiouſneſs, convictions ſtiffled, and the convincing ſpirit of God counteracted and grieved. Hence all the renewed pleadings for, & diſcoveries of truth, begets in moſt men (by a wofull *antiperiſtaſis*) nothing but renewed contradiction & ſpurnings againſt it, While (as the ſuns vigorus influence upon the vapors of this dull earth) by its irradiations it attracts, and condenſes thick foggs, dark clouds of peruerſe diſputings the more to obſcure it ſelf. Yet a holy ſeed there is and hath been in all generations, children of light and of the day, whoſe work, and honourable badge it is to contend and be valiant for the truth; who under the conduct of *Michael* that great prince who ſtands up for his people (truths ſincere lo-

vers

ters and asserters) have from the beginning warred this good warfare against that old apostat, and his followers. So that the warr which John saw in heaven, betwixt *Michael* and the *Dragon*, was not then only begun, but a new battel and encounter of that old warr proclaimd in paradise betwixt the seed of the woman and the serpent. All men are inrolled in one of these two armies, imbarques in one of these interests according as they are regenerat, or unregenerat, as they have the seed of God in them or not; & discovries of truth have various effects accordingly, either of more intense love, or violent hatred, as the sun shining upon the flowers & dunghil, draws equally forth a sweet & stinking savour. The erecting of this royal standart of Zions King and lawgiver ingadges his faithfull witnesses to flow unto it, and come under it, and excits such who have but *the spirit of that world in them*, to a counter-muster against it. Who would not have thought, that the longed for appearances of that *Immanuel*, and desire of all nations, that *eternal word and wisdom of God* in the flesh, should have put an end to

all

all rebellion of wretched ſinners againſt him; but it never grew more, then by his convincing diſcovries of himſelf. Eternal truth and holines ſuffred contradiction of ſinners againſt himſelf, he oft ſilenced enemies reaſonings, not their malice, and the moſt admirable actings of his effectionat condeſcending love to men, *the giving of himſelf to death for them*, was intertained with the moſt virulent and helliſh eruptions of their wrath againſt him, in murthring him. The rulers oppoſed this great *ruler of Iſrael*, the learned ſcribes and rabbies with all their literal knowledge of Moſes and the Prophets, could not yea would not ſee and acknowledge this *great Prophet*, the covenanted people would not receive this great *meſſenger of the Covenant*; and they who boaſted to be *Abrahams ſeed*, rejected this *promiſed ſeed*, could not ſee him when among them, but hated him, whom *Abraham ſaw a far off*, and rejoyced in the diſcovery. Yet this wiſdom of God was then, and ſtill is, *juſtified of all children of God*, and ſuch as are of the truth will ſee its beauty throw all the miſts

miſt of mens calumnies and contendings againſt it.

The angry cloud wherwith God hath now of a conſiderable time covered the daughterof Zion in our land, challenges in this as much as in any thing elſe, our *mournfull obſervation, & ſimpathizing compaſſion*, that men have taken the boldnes, with perverſe diſputings to infeſt her true ſons and children, to aſſault her precius ordinances and priviledges, and with a barefac'd impudence to indeavour the removal of the *ancient land marks* which our fathers have ſet, nay which the great God hath eſtabliſhed. Yea to cajoll us with poor ſophiſtry into a carleſs diſregard and abandoning of the *magnalia Dei*, the great things of gods Law (important truths and dueties) as if they were meer trifles and indifferencies; to caſt the aſperſions of *ſupercilius ſcrupuloſitie* upon *true zeal* for God, of *rebellion*, upon true *loyalti* and *faithfulneſs* to the King of ſaints, of *deviſive humor*, upon ſincer indeavours after the *union and true order* of the houſe of God, is it not to put light for darknes and darknes for light, bitter for

ſweet

wee t, and ſweet for bitter, yea cruel ſupercilius mockrie. Yet at this rate are we treated by our prelatick pamphleters. The authority of the ſecond great moral precept anent the *receiving and maintaining of all gods ordinances*, the doct. worſh. diſc. and governm. of his houſe, the weight and importance of the third anent the obſervation of *moſt ſacred ſolemn oathes and vowes to him* for this great end, weighes but light in theſe mens ballances; but he whoſe hand holds the plummet and line judgeth otherwiſe, their ballances are falſe, not the ballances of the ſanctuary. Their new plagiary divinity dependingin a great meaſure upon the camelion-rule of worldly wiſdom, and ſteering its courſe by the verſatil rule of human lawes, iscalculat for any meridian, but that of *canaan* & *immanuels land*, where all muſt go to his Law and teſtimony, and is pronounced baſe mettal, which is reprobat by that touchſton, where every pin of the tabernacle muſt have its ſamplar from the *holy mount*, ere it get his approbation, and have the cloud of his glorious preſence created upon it. The golden,

den preface giving a luſtre & beauty unto the prophets meſſage was, *thus ſaith the lord*, but theſe mens ordinary Anthem is *thus ſaith the Law*, preſenting their diſhes under that leaden cover. Our new *Aſhodits* have loſt the language of Canaan, or at beſt do but ( like thoſe mungrels mentioned by Nehemia ) ſpeak half the Jewes language, half of aſhdod, debaſing thus the golden rule, by a heterogenens mixtur of human teſtimonies & principles. O How is our wine mixt with Water, the beauty of the virgin Daughter of Zion defaced. That Gebal, Ammon, Amalek & ſuch like do inſeſt & take crafty councel againſt Gods Church, is nothing ſo amazing or dangerous as when there is *a conſpiracy of her prophets* within her walls. 'Tis a great queſtion whither theſe mens *malice* in *wounding our Church*, and taking away her vail, while pretending to act the guardians and watchmen, or their treachery in ſuperficial flight *healing of her wound*, will be found the deepeſt challenge when the great ſhepherd comes to plead with them. But ſure, both the one and the other will make make up a dre-

adfull impeacement. Who ever ſaw this houſe of God in our married land, in its priſtine glory & integrity, can but mourn over the preſent deſolation. Theſe gates once called *praiſe*, have now *deſolation* ſet upon their threſhold. Theſe walls once called *ſalvation*, are laid in duſt & *rubbiſh*. The joyfull ſound and voice of the turtle (echoed with the ſinging of birds, and vigorus heart motions towards the glorious bridgroom) are turned into the harſh ſound of enemies roarings, and direfull threats, crying raze it raze it to the foundation. To ſee *Bethel* turned *Bethaven*, and men, yea pretended builders, lifting up axes not upon the thick trees to advance the building of the houſe, but upon the carved work, to deſtroy it, may make ane impreſſion of ſorrow upon any heart, but that of adamant. Iſrael wept at the ſad newes of Gods refuſing to go with them unto the promiſed land, but eſpecialy when they were brought back from the very borders of Canaan for their diſobedience and unbelief, & doomed to return and die in the wilderness, ſpending the remainder of their dayes

dayes and yeares in vanity and trouble. 'Tis long ſince the glorious cloud is withdrawn to the threſhold of our ſanctuary, and the darke, not the auſpicius light ſome ſide, turned unto us, yet who are following the glory, who are found crying out a penitent [*Ichabod*] over its departing. The building was ſo far advanced, that we were expecting to ſee the headſton brought forth with ſhoutings and acclamations of grace grace, to ſee the glorius accompliſhment of a work of reformation in Britaine and Ireland, but ah! we are brought back from the borders of this great hope of a compleated reformation, into this wilderneſs of the muſt diſmall deſolation that ever the work of God hath been expoſed unto ſince the foundation thereof was laid. What means the heat of this great anger, and where will it iſſue? A fire is kindled in his anger, a fire of angry Jealouſie, but ſhall it burn for ever, is there none to make up the breach and ſtand in the gap.

Ezekiel ſaw the healing waters iſſuing from the temple, and upon a deſirable auſpicius advanc, firſt to the ankles, then

the knees: then to the loins, and at laſt a great river. But now the waters of our *Mara*, the Serpents flood of errour caſt out after the fleeing Woman, and of prophanity flowing from our defiled ſanctuary, have been long flowing apace, & are become of a prodigious grouth. Our Preſbyterian Church-judicatories, are not ſtraitned only by the invaſion of the ancient *Proſtaſie*, or fixed moderator, (which coſt K. James ſome pains to effectuat) but their root muſt be plucked up, either as Presbyterian, or as Eccleſiaſtick courts; all their deciſive power contracted into a Prelats *ipſe dixit;* and all his pretended ſpiritual authority, reſolving into the *ſic volo* of a civil papacy, regulable by it ſelf onely, no ſuperiour rule. How deeply we have drunk of the whoors cup; and what a deluge of monſtruous wickedneſs, hath overwelmd us ſince this idol of jealouſie was ſet up, ought rather to be weept over then written. The name of our Church is no more *Jehova Shamma, the Lord is there*, nay that glorious motto is turned unto the doleſull inſcription of *Lo-ammi Lo-ruhama* not any people, not having obtained mercy

And

And, which is ſtrange, this monſtruous *Dagon* of *Eraſtian Prelacy* like a *Meduſa* hath charmd the generation into ane amazing ſtupidity, yea the moſt unto an adoration of it, though it hath oftner then once faln before Gods Ark, and its head and hands have been cutt off upon the threſhold of the ſanctuary, a convincing proof that it is not a God. But that it might not want the dedication and adoration of its fellow ſet up in *the plain of Dura*, it hath been attended with the menacing Heralds voice—*to you it is commanded*- and *who Worships not &c.*- And the melodious Harmony of *charming muſitians*. The quills of our Prelatick pleaders and Pamphleters have ſtruke up their beſt notes and meaſures to gain the deſigne. But the *Menaces*, and the *Idols golden mettal* have far ut done the muſitians in *perſuading*, whoſe *treeples* of old & of late, have met with ſuch baffling *Contra's* that the ſagacius eare is not fond of ther ſhril ſounds. Which have long ſince krakt the ſtrings of our ſound Proteſtant principles.

For this late Pamphleter, who hath dreſt up minc't-meat of ſoom old fragmens to pleaſe childiſh Pallats, I ſuppoſe few or none who have pierc't into the bowels of our preſent controverſies, have judged him ſo conſiderable, as to deſerve a formal encounter, there being nothing which he or any of our late Scriblers hath offered, but what is already ſufficiently anſwered. So that theſe litle toying mean Dialogues, were like to paſſe along as ſecurely in their own want of worth, as *Beſſus in the Comedy*. Yet in one point or two I cannot but commend him, firſt that the ſubſtance of this book anſwers its inſcription of *the differences of the time*, theſe 3 points being indeed the chief *cardines* of our preſent differences, in which had he ſatisfyed all the Presbyterian arguments he had done much to cut the ſinnews of their cauſe. But how far are we at a loſſe in this Expectation, when the book is lookt over, not one of theſe great queſtions *fairly ſtated*, ſcarce one Argument of Presbyterians ſo much as fairly propoſed, but enfeebled by ſilly diſguiſes, and the anſwers to them ſuch poor and ridicu-

ridiculous evaſions, as if he had intended in this diſcovry of the weaknes of his cauſe to proſelyt his Readers into Presbyterians, if they were not ſuch before, in ſtead of weakning that party by this new aſſault; the great point of *Eraſtianiſm* not ſo much as once toucht: And ſo notwithſtanding of all his defence of the Dioceſian Biſhop, the Eraſtian Biſhop Lying opene to all the weapons, & wounds of ſuch as have impugned thoſe principles. And upon the debate about the *Covenants*, and *Separation*, the only preſents us with ſoomwhat of their old muſty ſtore, who have appeared in this cauſe of late, whoſe notions are more crude after all this mans *recocting*, a convincing proof that there was in the firſt concoction, *ane indigeſtible error*. Next I find ſome what more of a *ſeren temper*, leſſe of the *ſarcaſtick ſcolding ſtrain*, then what hath tinctured his fellew-actors upon this ſceen, who have bravely ſcolded it out againſt the Preſbyterians, even to a *non ultra* of that *Therſites - artifice*, although now and then he puts out his litle ſting too this way. In ſoom things alſo his *Ingenuity*

deſerys its praiſe, in advancing *Prelacy* ſo neer the *popes miter*, both in his pleadings from the *Jewish Prieſthood*, & from antiquity, wherein he hath purtrayed the beaſt in *exacter lineaments*, then ſoom moreſmooth pleaders. His Character of the term [*Curat*] *viz on that ſerves the cure though not the Miniſter of the place*, and of their preaching upon ſhorter texts, that it is a *racking of the Text and of their brains to find out matter*, is honeſt and appoſit, for which the Presbyterians do owe him thanks; but thereby their doubts in the point *of Prelacy*, & the preſent *Separation*, are ſo ſtrengthned, and like to grow, and eſpecially by his *feeble reſolutions*, that they verily judge he ſhall never prove the *Œdipus*, but is in extreme haſart to be devoured in this encounter, & *Actæon-like*, to be torn in pieces by the kennell of his own pretended reſolutions and Arguings, retorted and hunted back upon him. They do alſo look upon the Dialogizing Method, ſo much pleaſing him & ſome of his fellowes, as a cover (but now very dilucid and tranſparent) to hide

to hide the childiſh ſophiſtry, of diſguiſing the true ſtate of queſtions, and the ſtrength of Presbyterian Arguments, while they muſt fight with no weapons, but of their *adverſaries choice and meaſuring:* When the *Knight* enters the liſts with a huge invincible gyant, the encounter looks very unequall, and fatall like to the ſprightly litle Combatant; but the *Romance maker* can ſo order the ſcene, that he ſhall be ſure to lay his adverſary all a long, and come off victorious. Our Adverſaries have too long ridicul'd our ſerious *Theologicall debates*, with their *play-bookes*; wherein they do but render themſelves ridiculous. what hath the chaff to do with the wheat? When will they offer a *fair and formall enucleation of this controverſy*, and diſcuſſe our Arguments long ſince offered unto them, which do ſtand to this day unanſwered? How long will they beg Principles, beg conceſſions, and rear up ſoaring like Arguments upon a Chimæricall fundation, and then Accoſt their credulous hearers or readers with Thraſonik boaſts and Rhetoricall Rhodomontadoes,

which are as insipid and tastlesse to the discerning, as the Artificiall fruit to the hungry pallat.

Reader, for the design of this undertaking, I have this to say, that although I have as litle as many men coveted such appearances, yet have been perswaded to be thus publick upon this occasion, that having casually met with this Pamphlet, after it had for a considerable time travelled up and down, I judged it expedient to employ upon it some solitary houres, wherein I was taken off from other employments, both to prevent languishing, and to satisfy the desire of a friend, whom I highly esteem; as likewayes to undeceive some simpler and lesse discerning readers, who seem'd to be taken with this piece; which essay after a considerable times lurking coming into the hands of some welwishers to our Zion, I did at last yield to their importunity in reference to the publication. Whatever entertainment this may meet with, and how keen soever the darts of malicious reproach may prove which are levelled at me, *Hic murus Aheneus esto*, I have this shield, that

I can

I can ſay it before the heart ſearcher, without heart condemning, that as I intended herein a vindication of Truth and duty, and according to my meaſure and capacity to give this teſtimony for it, to the ſtrengthning of a poor afflicted remnant contending for the ſame, ſo in writing theſe ſheets, I had an eye upon the father of lights for his help and preſence, and dare not deny but that this was found in ſome good meaſure accordingly. And in the peruſal of what is here offered unto publick view (which was not at firſt directly my intention) I would have thee looking after theſe with other emprovements.

Firſt, thou may diſcover what a honourable cauſe wee now contend for, even the Crown dignity and Royal prerogative of Jeſus Chriſt, his glorious ſupremacy over his own houſe, in appointing its officers, lawes, ordinantes; for the true frame of his tabernacle according to the pattern ſhewed upon the mount, for that Government of his houſe delivered in his perfect and glorious teſtament, ſealed with his blood, for fealty & loyalty

to

to this King of Kings, in keeping his Covenant into which this nation and Church ſo ſolemnly entered; for the walls and bulwarks of this City of God in oppoſition to antichriſtian underminers and invaders thereof, for theſe ſolemn Aſſemblies of his ſaints upon the ancient grounds and principles of our Reformation (ſo much now aſperſed by devouring tongues) the ceaſing wherof in our Zion ought to engage to ſorrow, and a lamenting after our provoked Lord, now hiding himſelf from us. Enemies have often invaded him upon his his throne of grace, and profeſſed friends have not ſincerely aproach'd unto it.

Next, As to our adverſaries pleading againſt us in this quarrel, thou mayeſt diſcover firſt, that they are ſnar'd, as by the works of their hands, ſo by the Words of their lips, and fall before the rebound of their our Arguments; this mans pleadings againſt us, eſpecially upon the point of ſeparation, levelling ſo clearly againſt himſelf, that ſuch who impartially read him upon his point mayſtraight entertain this reflection, *Itis hard for thee to kick againſt the pricks*, and that its eaſy to pull this

Egyp-

Egyptians ſpear out of his hand and kill him with his own ſpear. Secondly, thou may ſee, what monſtrous iſſues they are driven unto in the defence of their cauſe, what a chain of contradictions & abſurdities they have twiſted to wind themſelves out of their inextricable *Labirinth*, that they hatch cockatric eggs; obſtinat maintaining of one abſurdity begets a hundred; ſo true is that ſaying & prophecy, *evil men ſhall waxe worſe & worſe deceiving, & being deceived.* How palpably have they wreſted the holy Scriptures to ſhift the convictions thereof, and make ſome ſhift of anſwer? How laxe and abſurd are their new principles in *point of Oaths*, reſolving their ſtrength into the Magiſtrates arbitriment and Lawes; beſides other odd poſterns which they have opened to eſcape allobligations thereby, if their matter be not indiſpenſably neceſſary, which with them is in a great meaſure determined by the Law. What a monſtrous *Chaos* of more then Infidel-barbarity and confuſion ſhall this world become, if theſe mens faith-baniſhing principles be once admitted. Thirdly, to evince, that our Prelats

lats puppets and new pleaders are Babells true brood and builders, thou mayeſt ſee, how ſweetly they joyn with the Papiſts in their gloſſes upon theſe Scirptures, pleaded againſt them. Whence it is evident, even to a *demonſtrative certainty*; that the cauſe of *popry and prelacy*, are of ane *inſeparable affinity*, and ſtand or fall together. If this mans gloſſes whereby he ſhifts off our Scripture Arguments, ſtriking at the *Bishops mitre*, be once admitted, the *popes triple crown* is equally ſhielded againſt the weapons of all Proteſtants. Our learn'd Proteſtant divines in confuting the popiſh evaſions do ſo manage their diſpute, as if they were directly pleading againſt this *Informer* in defending *our Prelacy*. And who heares his gloſſings, pleadings and anſwers, would imagine that by ſome *Metempſuchoſis*, Bellarmine or Eccius were now acting the *Informer* to proſelyt the Presbyterians to our Prelacy or a papacy rather. Beſides, 't is clear he embarques, with the Papiſts in his endeavour to bring in antiquity and the Churches practice, as the infallible comment upon the Scripture in the Epiſcopall debate, conſequently in all debats in Theology

ology. Nay we muſt meaſure the Temple and the Altar, mould our Arguments in this point of truth by *Scripture-ſtandard*; but for the utter court of *Antiquity*, wee leave it out, for its given to the Gentiles. Its many ſoul principles and practices will not be gotten within the Holy Scripture verge. This man in his Scripture pleadings is very ſparing, for a few pages meaſure will do it. But for Antiquity ware he mets us out large and full, to the great part of all the book; and in this he deals honeſtly giving the *courſer ſtuff* the *larger yard*.

In fine, thou may ſee theſe men diſcovered beyond all their hiding pretences of love, peace and unity; their large ſpacious charity (extended to the dimenſions of a Metropolitans pallace) hath fine entertaining rooms for *Papiſts*, *Quakers*, *Arminians*, &c. but the poor *Presbyterians* will ſcarce get ſuch a room in it as Biſhop Bonners colehouſe wherein he lodged the martyrs; they cry out one Preſbyterian Miniſters as refuſing all *Chriſtian fellowship with them in worship*: but when ſhall weſee them *open their pulpits* to our Miniſters, after they have baniſh'd them

them from their own flocks? They vilifie all our differences unto meere *punctilioes*; yet they contend about them *tanquam pro aris & focis*, and had rather all Presbyterians were haraſſed and perſecuted, even to a conſuming deſolation, then one *fringe of their Garments*, (As Biſhop Lighton call'd the points debated) were cut off and let go. They declame zealouſly in their pulpits and Pamphlets againſt *ſanguinary Principles*. How can theſe cruell men, ſay they, *looke up to the God of love?* But now after they have drunk pretty largely for many years of *Presbyterian blood*, and are gaping for more as faſt as the bloody whore of Rome who in a great meaſure influences them, theſe devout *Burrio's*, can wipe their mouths, and pretend they have *peace offerings* with them. Miſtery Babylon! *My*ſtery Prelacy! What ane abyſſe of deceit is here.

In the third place, thou may ſee, that the cauſe wee contend for, as it hath the firſt and *pure Scripture Antiquity*, ſo the next enſuing Antiquity alſo, and the patrociny of the purer ages, and the auſpici-

piciouſly Harmonious conſent of *reformed Churches and divines*; So that our preſent Teſtimony is the ſame with that of the *witneſſes againſt the beaſt*, and our adverſaries ſtand arranged under *Antichriſts banner*, in the whole ſeries at leaſt & complex *farrago* of their principles. *A Dioceſian Eraſtian Prelacy, underprop't by blood and Perjury, headed by a civill papacy, embracing in its boſome all foul errours*, is a hideous Monſter, a bowing wall, a tottering fence, and lookes in face and feature ſo unlike to Chriſts bride, held out and pourtrayed in Scripture, and once glorioufly ſhining in this land, that no diſciple of Chriſt no friend of the *Bridegroom*, can miſtake the one for the other; So that our adverſaries charge of *novell heterodoxy* is a new minted calumny, *a fright ing buk bear* and *ſcar-cnow* fit to fright children in knowledge, to be the deriſion of the knowing, and for nothing elſe.

Fourthly, thou haſt here ſet before thee, a looking glaſſe repreſenting our *ſin and puniſhment in theſe later dayes*. Wee have not ſuitably emproven a faith-

 full

full Miniſtry (once our Churches crown and glory) now that crown is falling apace; how many ſtars hath the dragon caſt from heaven to earth. Wee have not not ſtudied *perſonall reformation*, while publick *Nationall reformation* was owned; therefore the holy Jealous God hath given us up to an *avowed diſowning* of that reformation. Wee endeavoured not, while Gods candle ſhin'd upon our tabernacle, to get our caſe diſcovered and ſearch'd, our hearts ſprinkled from an evill Conſcience, therefore moſt of us are given up to Conſcience - Waſting ſins. We have not drawn with joy, from our *wells of ſalvation*, while they were open and running in a plenty of powerfull & pure ordinances; now God hath ſuffered Philiſtines to *ſtop theſe Wells;* and while wee endeavour to dig them again, ſuch are the counter endeavours of this man and his fellowes by their pleading and practices, that they are called *Ezek* and *Sitna*, ſtrife and contention. Wee are like to dig and ſtrive long ere wee get the well called *Rehoboth*, and faithfull Ambaſſadours of Chriſt ſhall find their

old

*old rooms again* in the houſe of God. Wee have not keept up a due impreſſion of the obligding force of our National & ſolemne Covenants with God; who of us have endeavoured to *perform our vowes to God* therein? Therefore God hath given moſt of us up to a *palpable diſowning* and ſhameleſſe renunciation and abjuration of theſe *great and ſacred Oaths*. Wee hid our ſelves from diſcoveries of our *practical breaches* and many whoriſh departings from God pointed at by our faithfull Seers; now he hath given us up to a *legall avowed departing*. *The accurſed thing* which was before ſecretly with us, is now pleaded for, diſputed for, by pretended Seers and wathmen; even the remnant have dealt treacherouſly with God; therefore he hath given them up to treacherous dealers, who have dealt very treacherouſly with them. Wee were wearied of reformation, wearied of God, and ſaid to our faithfull ſeers, ſee not, prophecy not right things, but deceits, get you out of the way, cauſe the holy one of Iſrael to ceaſe from before us. Our whoriſh hearts luſted after a ſinfull liberty and Egypts fleſh-

 pots

pots, neither were wee throughly cleanged from our old ſins *our iniquities of peo*
Therefore God hath *anſwered us according to the Idols of our heart*, and hath ſaid to us (after wee have ſet up our Calves) *go to Bethel, tranſgreſſe at Gilgall, &c.* He hath given us our deſire and ſent leanneſſe into our ſoul. Our *noble Vine*, becauſe ſo dreadfully degenerat, is now *whithered and waſted, plukt up in fury*, planted in the wilderneſſe and *fire* going out of it ſelf to devour its own fruit. This is a lamentation and ſhall be for a lamentation.

Fiftly, Thou mayeſt in the peruſal of this reply, diſcover ſomthing alſo of *light ariſing in darkneſſe*, the ſtrength and ſolidity of our principles demonſtrate in the plain and eaſy repulſe of theſe aſſalliants. The indigeſted chattered *congeries of their new notions* do appear but meer vanity, a deceitfull nothing, when levelled againſt theſe *great truths* which wee contend for, notwithſtanding of all their clamorous boaſting; as the threatning billowes having made a wateriſh battery upon the rock fall off again in empty froath

froath; ſo that we may ſee it accompliſhed of our cauſe and principles which was Jobs hope as to the iſſue of his troubles *when they are tryed they come forth* as gold. And our adverſaries light empty crakets cannot by thouſands of degrees counterpoiſe them, when both are laid together in the even *Scripture Ballances*. *Truth* under all ſtroakes *Vireſcit Vulnere* the bruiſing of it by diſputes diffuſes it ſcent and makes it (as the breaking of that Alabaſter box did the oyntment) the more fragrant. Thus our holy wiſe God brings meat out of the eater; its the Priviledge of Truth, in relation to perverſe diſputes againſt it, which was promiſed to Zion, when enemies were gathered together, that it doth *ariſe & threſh them* The Horns of this honourable cauſe are found horns of Iron and its hooves braſſe: it can threſh (as it hath done before) even the mountains: (For what are they before Zerubbabel) and ſift and fann them as duſt. This is a ſignal token for good in the dark and cloudy day, that theſe great truths, which are now become the *Shibboleth*, the ſpeciall object of our Teſtimony, and

 adhe-

adherence thereunto, the characteriſtick of the Lambs followers, are confirmed and ſhining in a heart engadging beauty: if we hold faſt this Teſtimony wee are ſure to come off victorious, to get the white ſtone & the new name: If wee quit and caſt off this fortifying girdle of Truth, we will ſuccumb, and be written in the duſt, not among the living in Jeruſalem.

For the manner and Method of this reply, it will, I ſuppoſe be found very ſuitable to the ſcope. The language is plain and accommodat to polemicks, which do reject all extravagant ornaments of ſpeech. The *Informers* Arguments are propoſed *vivida, vegeta, ad amiſſim* oft times *verbatim*, and nothing of ſeeming ſtrength or nerves in his reaſoning declined, but fully weighed and examined. The Presbyterian Arguments, which he hath diſguiſed, are preſented and offered in their genuine ſtrength, and fully improven againſt him; Wherin this trifler is called to the orders, and his tergiverſation check't and made appear. The ſtate of every one of theſe queſtions is likewayes

wayes propoſed, and Arguments drawen forth thereupon, which do abundantly fortify the Presbyterian cauſe and Principles, and in a great meaſure obviat all his Exceptions, and this in the beginning of every Dialogue before any formall encounter with him. So that if any ſhall endeavour again to underprop this tottering wall and to draw this ſaw back again, they muſt be tyed to the ſame Methode; weighing all that is offered in the ſound ballances of Scripture and reaſon, and not in ſuch a faint, ſuperficiall, diſpute-deſerting Methode as the Anſwer to the Dialogues betwixt the Conformiſt and Non-conformiſts hath been plyed with; whoſe replyer doth but (like the dogs at *Nilus*) leape here & there ſuperficially thus meaſuring out the dimenſions of the whole book with litle or nothing of a formall encounter with the Anſwerer his Arguments and reaſons.

Some things there are, that do require a litle touch of Apology; if any quarrel the prolixity, 't is eaſily granted that a ſufficient anſwer might have been contracted into far leſſe bounds; yet as every writers head or hand is not ſo ſkilful as to

*put*

*put ane Iliad into a nut*, ſo every reader hath not the tooth to crack that nut; marrow is nauſeating rather then nouriſhing to many ſtomaks. And as the ſtronger condenſed light of the Sun, whither in its direct, or refracted beams, hurts weaker eyes; ſo all eyes are not for the ſmall print of the Laconick ſtile, nor can every judgement readily digeſt too much epitomized arguings, eſpecially in ſuch ſubjects wherein the ſpiſſitude and variety of the matter, requires a more dilated ſtile and method. The fair ſtating of theſe great points (now the axletree, about which our religious differences are turn'd) the giving of light unto them by ſolid Arguments may well bear the charge of ſome little paines in reading in order to ſatiſfaction therein; and the man is a wretched miſer who would be ſcant as to the affording of time and diligence in this endeavour.

If any deſiderat a more particular *Examen* of the Teſtimonies of the Fathers and ſome other Authors cited by the *Informer*; there are ſeveral grounds which may take off this exception. Firſt, ſince,

upon

upon both ſides it is profeſſedly agreed that the ſcripture is the only judge in this debate, and ſince both parties now contending (as alſo the fathers themſelves and all ſound Chriſtians) have profeſſed to ſubſcribe ane abſolute appeal to this judge in matters of religion (whatever deviations from this rule and profeſſion, this man and his fellowes are guilty of in their arguings and pleadings, eſpecially in this point) matters, I ſay, ſtanding thus in this debate among profeſſed Proteſtants, who are diſputing from ſcripture, certainly a critical ſcanning of, or litigious contest about the ſenſe of every humane writer, they muſt in their principles acknowledge to be but a digladiation de *lana caprina*, a ſpending of money for that which is not bread. When any diſputant hath with much critical travel among the fathers, brought home their ſuffrage to his cauſe, or by the ſame diligence taken it out of an adverſaryes hand as it were with his ſword and this bow, what is all the victory? a humane teſtimony brought to fortify a *divine truth* (which was before ſtrong and impregnable in its own light and authori-

ty) and a teſtimony apt to a wiredrawn by a ſubtiler Critick to a different or contrary ſenſe. Next, the ſcriptures deciſion in this debat, being (as it is hoped) convincingly made appear, and the chief teſtimonies of fathers for our cauſe vindicated againſt this adverſary, no rational or ingenuous reader will judge it expedient, after the ſcripture deciſion is made appear and the teſtimonies of eminent fathers alſo, and the adverſaryes contrary humane teſtimonyes, as to the main, diſpelled, to purſue every ſtragling citation. Thirdly, 't is evinced that as upon the one hand all his teſtimonyes upon the point of Prelacy, though admitted, do but amount to demonſtrat the *factum*, which is not the queſtion, and not all the *Jus*, which only is, ſo upon the other hand they are as far ſhort of reaching any patrociny to the preſent *Dioceſian Eraſtian Prelat* as the Pigmees arme is to fetch down Ulyſſes helmet. Now what ſuperfluous waſt of time were it to inſiſt in ſcanning of teſtimonyes adduced to prove that which is not the queſtion? the diſputant hath but a mean labour in trying whether his adverſaryes

ſaryes concluſion is deduced according to rules, and followes on the premiſes, when the concluſion it ſelf is a long dayes journey out of the liſts and ranges of the queſtion; and not the *negatum* or the principle which the adverſary undertakes to prove. If any man will from this *Informers* teſtimonyes draw out our *Dioceſian Eraſtian Prelat*, in the nature and extent of the power now exerciſed by him, he may give a defie to all the *Virtuoſi* to match him in chymical extractions, and may have the chief chair for invention. All the fathers cited by this diſputant are as ambiguous as the Delphick Oracles in our debate. *In fine*, this piece is chiefly addreſſed to the plain ſimple ſearcher for truth, to furniſh him with ſtones from mount Zions brook (with plain ſcripture Arguments) to encounter and overcome our Philiſtine braggards: not to charge his unſkilful weake ſhoulders and armes with Sauls unwieldy armour. How taſtleſſe and uſeleſſe to the unlearn'd, a diſpute about the ſenſe of humane writers is, when the inquiry and debate is about a divine truth, wherein the conſcience muſt

be

be ſatisfied upon divine warrand, needs not my pains to prove, it being obvious to the meaneſt reflection. If any ſhall yet except upon the want of a full examination of ſome Commentators upon ſcripture, whom the *Informer* appeales unto, 't is anſwered, that if the ſenſe of controverted texts be evinced from parallels, and the ſcope and contexture, and the Adverſaryes argument repelled, the humane teſtimony or ſenſe of ſome Interpreters muſt vail to this in the judgment of all Proteſtants; and beſides, neither the ſuffrage of Commentators is wanting to our ſenſe of theſe ſcriptures we plead, nor can this mans gloſſes be reconciled to the ſenſe of ſound Proteſtants. Which wee ſuppoſe the reader will find aboundantly clear in the Peruſal. The learn'd do know that wee might muſter up as many commentators ſuffrages to patroniſe our ſenſe of text controverted, as would *ſpatio conficere immenſum æquor*. The truth is, that with ſome, wee will need an Apology, in that, this piece is ſwelled to ſuch a bulk upon this ground, & that ſo much of it is taken up in preſenting and ſcanning the ſenſe of authors;

thors; beſides, the many teſtimonyes of reformed Churches and divines for Presbyterian Government which wee have preſented in a ſhort view in the laſt Chapter upon the firſt Dialogue, do, conſequently give ſentence for us, as to the ſenſe of the texts ſcanned in this controverſy, and more then counterballance any whom this man appealls unto.

Some, 't is probable, may think ſtrange, that the *Informer* hath ſo far got the ſtart of this *corrector*, and travelled ſo long before this appeared; but ſuch may be quickly ſatiſfyed as to this *punctilio* of a *time-ceremony*, when they are made to underſtand that as this piece was a long time abroad ere ever I did ſee it, ſo after ſome ſight of it, it was a conſiderable time before I had the leaſt intention of imparting my thoughts of it, & after I had this imparted them much more time did interveen before my intention did fully correſpond with the preſſe motions, & acceſſe where it could be had. But however, the knowing reader will not ſo much value *who* replyed, or *when*; as *what* and *how*. *Sat cito ſi ſat bene*, is a ſound proverb: although (if this matter

matter did deſerve any more Apology) it might be truly averred that the ſubſtance of this reply, all to a very little was written in the moneths of June and July in the Year 1681. ſince which time theſe ſheets were much lurking and out of my hands. And but little opportunity offered for boring them through exactly after the writing thereof. Yet upon ſome renewed deſires, as to the publication I did again haſtily look them over amidſt many avocations, dividing the whole into Chapters for Methods ſake, with ſuitable inſcriptions containing the ſumm & ſeries of the chief points treated of; having alſo acceſſe to peruſe ſome Authors which were not by me at firſt writing, ſome inlargements were made which have much encreaſed it to this bulk, and 't is probable may make it prove rugged in ſeveral places, and not ſo intelligible to the plainunlearned reader, for whom at firſt writing it was principally, if not only, intended; yet for his advantage the Citations of Authors are all Engliſhed, and ſome times rendered only in English, and often upon repeating ſome few of the Authors words, the ſentence

ſentence is broken off & the reſt preſented in our own language: which if it ſeem ſtrange to any other; as the ground aſſigned will, I hope, ſatisfy, ſo a view of the Authors will be my vindication as to the truth of the teſtimonyes themſelves.

Upon the point *of Separation* (which is a difficult and comprehenſive queſtion) I have not undertaken any large ſcrutiny into its nature and degrees, nor to ſcann the ſeverall incident caſes and ſubordinat queſtions, which the full diſcuſſing of that great point would require; deſiring only to maintain the antitheſis of the *Informers* principle and fundamentall Topick in the third Dialogue, and in ſo far only to enquire into this point as to vindicat this practice of presbyterian Miniſters and profeſſours their owning and following their reſpective duties, from his imputation of a ſinfull and Schiſmatick ſeparation; and therefore have not directly ſpoken to theſe caſes, viz. what may be ſaid for, or againſt Conformiſts Miniſterial miſſion? What difference is in this our caſe betwixt a *fix'd or ſtated*, and *ane occaſional hearing*. In what caſes it might

might be abstracted from a formall owning of Curats as Ministers of this Church? Whether a protestation at first hearing might be a sufficient *salvo* to free the practic from that complyance which is pleaded from the narratives and declared design of the Acts which do enjoyn it? And upon the affirmative solution of this case, what might be the nature, extent and circumstances of such a protestation? Whither the diverse cases and dispensations of severall places of our land, will import such a difference as to sin or duty in this point, as there might be a diversity of practice and union keeped therupon? These and several such like cases I have not taken upon me formally to state and clear (whatever light about them may follow upon what is here asserted) not finding it necessary in order to the scope of this defence, as the question with this *Informer* is stated and limited, norbeing desirous to render this reply of too great a bulk, or to be forward and presuming in difficult points. If the learned and Judicious desiderat here many things both as to matter and manner, as I doubt

not,

not, they will; let not the Presbyterian cauſe and intereſt fall under the worſe Character with them; this being but ane eſſay upon theſe great queſtions offered by a very mean perſon of that number, and not their joynt-polities and form'd thoughts; addreſſed alſo mainly to the plain and unlearned readers. Yet for its ſcope and ſubſtance, I doubt not, but it will be found ſuch as is able to ſpeake with the Enemy in the gate, and ſucceſesfully to undergoe their aſſaults, if any ſuch be made upon't. One thing is indeed to be regrated, wherof I could not but acquaint the reader in this place, that Becauſe of many difficulties which the overſeer of the firſt part, in Anſwer to the firſt Dialogue, at the preſſe, did labour under, Both in reſpect of the Copy and ſeveral other wayes, there are ſome conſiderable Tipographical errours which have creept into it, and ſeveral Latine and Greeck words miſrepreſented; of which errors, ſuch as do conſiderably marr the ſenſe are noted among the *Errata*. The other parts t'is hoped will not be ſo bad, & create the Reader ſuch difficulty. (***) I ſhall

I ſhall alſo here acquaint the Reader, that I have ſeen a manuſcript entituled, *Poſitions relating to publick worſhip, maintained by Presbyterians In former times, and contradicted by the practice of many in theſe dayes*, driving the ſame deſign with this *Informer* in his third Di. alogue, and upon the ſame grounds, whereof I had written a conſiderable time ſince a full *Examen*, but cannot here preſent it: both, becauſe that *paſquil* is not extant; and eſpecially, becauſe it is for ſubſtance fully anſwered in this reply. The Author upon theſe general acknowledged grounds of the *obligation, lying upon all Church-members to attend the ordinances: the unlawfulneſſe of ſeparating from publick worship for the ſins of Miniſters or fellow-worshippers; the condemning of the Brouniſts in* England *by the old Non-conformiſts there, becauſe of a totall Separation, though themſelves did ſeparat in part: their acknowledging of the lawfulneſſe of Epiſcopal ordination for ſubſtance*, &c. drawes out a ſtrange and remote concluſion againſt Presbyterian

an Miniſters of this Church, their officiating in their preſent caſe & circumſtances, and peoples adhering to them in the exerciſe of their Miniſtry. The abſurdity of which inference, and what a *ſand-rope connexion* it is, needs not any renewed diſcovery here, which were but *Actum agere*. The impertinent and groundleſſe ſuppoſitions upon which this inference is founded, and the confuſed ſhufling together of that which in this queſtion is to be diſtinguiſhed, being aboundantly above evinced, and alſo the apparent inconſiſtency of this way and Method of Arguing: ſince from all theſe grounds a deſtroying concluſion may be drawn out againſt this paſquiller, in reference to the owning of Presbyterian Miniſters in their Miniſtry: ſince the ordinances adminiſtred by them are really ordinances of Chriſt, their miſſion and ordination warrantable, the worſhip not corrupted by their ſuppoſed ſcandals, and conſequently they are highly guilty who diſown their Miniſtry, or plead for it; or elſe to evite the deadly rebound of his own weapons and Arguing,

he muſt ſtate the queſtion of new, and reſtrict and limit to the particular ſtate and circumſtances of this Church; but then he muſt confeſſe his arguing upon theſe generall poſitions, to be but beating of the air and poor childiſh babling. It were not unpleaſant to trace the many groſſe contradictions incident to this way of arguing and apparent to men of an ordinary reach who have read this paper. Firſt, [attending of ordinances] add [receiving them from Conformiſts] are all one and identified with them, yea tyed with adamantine chains; yet in the caſe of Presbyterian Miniſters, theſe two are as far ſeparat, as eaſt & Weſt. Secondly nothing but a ſubſtantial corruption of ordinances adminiſtred by Conformiſts can warrand a withdrawing from them, & this principle ſayes the Author hath ſtrong Scripture grounds to warrand it, But take this principle over to Presbyterian Miniſters, and then it loſes all its vertue, and he will find grounds of ſeparating from them, were ordinances never ſo pure, and this is no ſtrange thing,

thing, the ſharpeſt ſighted eye cannot ſee it ſelf. Thirdly, a man can never be reconciled to himſelf, who confeſſes the Epiſcopal ordination lawful, and yet diſowns Conformiſts. But once turn the Tables, and the game runs croſſe; a man may acknowledge the Presbyterian Miniſters have a lawfull ordination, and never croſſe that principle; though he totally diſown them. There are alſo ſeveral groſſe inadvertencies, beſides theſe that are common with his fellowes in this way of arguing, which are peculiar to the Author of that Paſquil. Such as, his cutting the ſinews and overturning the fundation of his arguing, in *granting all to be true which Nonconformiſts charge prelatiſts with*, id eſt, *that they are Schiſmaticks &c.* So in the ſecond poſition. Yet holding, that this poſition viz. *That ordinances are not polluted by their Scandalls*, will inferr a concluſion of hearing them *hic & nunc;* Wheras this very ground of *Schiſme* is that upon which he mainly pleads for diſowning Presbyterian Miniſters,

 his

his confounding in the matter of Aerius his supposed censure by the ancient Church our acknowledgment of the *factum* and of the *Jus*. His denying in answer to the objection anent the Covenant, that any act under a General head of duty, considered Physically or materially, may become *hic & nunc*, and in its present circumstances sinful *exaccidente*, yet walking all along upon this very ground, in condemning the preaching of Presbyterian Ministers and peoples hearing them: In calling (in answer to another objection) *the Prelatick party the Church of Scotland as now constitute*; Yet in the premised concession acknowledging them *Schismaticks* from this Church: Thus stealing back a principle to make shift of answer, which he hath already given away to his adversary in this debate. In granting to the Presbyterians *that this frame of prelacy is worse then the former, and gives more to the Magistrate then Gods Word allowes*, yet calling this establishment of it, *the prerogatives of Authority* & the commands of sub-

ſubmiſſion thereunto *lawful commands*. Theſe & many ſuch like abſurdities are obvious to any that have read that chattered Paſquil: which might be made further convincingly appear if wee could dilate upon it and preſent the paſquil it ſelf. But this litle toutch may abundantly diſcover its vanity and inſufficiency in the preſent diſpute, and that the cauſe, which our Prelats puppets are pleading for, is ſo deſperat and tottering that it needs many conceſſions of its adverſaryes and beg'd ſuppoſitions to under-prop it withal, & yet ſo rotten is this fabrick and bowing wall, that it muſt notwithſtanding fall to the ground.

Reader, I ſhall detain thee no longer from the perſual of theſe ſheets, ſave only to tell thee that as the ſtrengthning of the hearts of the Lords remnant in following their duty and amidſt their preſent ſufferings, is the intendment of this appearance, ſo there is no patrociny intended, nor can be drawen by the moſt remote conſequence from what is here pleaded upon the point of ſeparation,

unto

unto theſe dreadfullly preſaging anti-miniſterial principles and practices, that ſeveral in this land are ſadly precipitating themſelves into; which wee hope will be aboundantly clear to the underſtanding peruſer of what I have offered upon that head, and the ſtate of the queſtion as It is exhibited: how clear and full our confeſſions and principles are in aſſerting the due right of Magiſtracy, as well as of a true Gofpel Miniſtry, and how harmoniouſly wee join to the confeſſions of all the Reformed Churches herein, is ſufficiently notour to the unbyaſſed and judicious; and conſequently, that no precipitations or ſtrayings from the ſcripture path upon theſe heads, can be charged upon our cauſe and principles. Great and manifold have been the aſſaults of Satan upon this poor Church, and reproaches of that grand accuſer of the brethren upon our Reformation and the faithful promoters thereof. And the plowers have long plowed upon her back, and enemyes of all ſorts have many time afflicted her from her youth.

youth. O that our provoked jealous God would shew us, wherefore he contends, and give both Ministers and People a heart-affecting sight and sense of the true grounds of this controversy, and shew unto us our transgressions, wherein wee have exceeded and provoked him thus to lengthen out our desolation; that he would exciteMinisters to make full proof of their ministry, and open up to them an effectual door and engadge his people to a due and suitable subjection to their Ministry that this word might run swiftly and this sword of the Lord eut the cords of the wicked, that wee were all excited to encompase his throne with strong crying and tears in order to the returning of the Ecclipsed departing glory that this great Shepherd Israel, would shew himself the only wise of God and the only Potentate in disappointing and crushing the crafty, cruel stratagems and designes of Satan (now acting both the roaring lyon and subtile old Serpent) and of his grand Lieutenant Antichrist and his Artizans. That this our Isle, upon which, the

day-

*day-ſpring from on high* did early ſhine, and which did early wait for his Law, who is Zions great Lawgiver, was recovered from Popiſh darkneſſe, and from decayes after the times of Reformation, may have a reſtoring healing viſit and being made a *maried land* may be upon this ground a *land of deſires*. That Chriſts Tabernacle, now fallen down, may be rear'd up according to the pattern, and planted among us untill his glorious appearance to accompliſh his Churches warfare and to make up his jewells. This is the Expectation of the priſoners of hope, and in this expectation let us turn in to the ſtrong hold, even to his name which is a ſtrong tower and go on in his ſtrength keeping his good way which hath alwayes been ſtrenth unto the upright. Let us contend for the faith once delivered to the ſaints and be ſtedfaſt, unmoveable, alwayes abounding in the work of the Lord, ſince he comes quickly, who is our head and judge and his reward is with him ſo that neither our labour nor ſuffering ſhall be in vain in the Lord.

# The Contents

## FIRST PART.


### Chap. 1. page 2.

THat the prelat now eſtabliſhed in this Church is both *Dioceſian* and *Eraſtian* cleared. By the preſent ſtanding acts hereanent page 2, 3. A twofold ſtate of the queſtion proponed accordingly, Arguments from Scripture againſt the Dioceſian Prelat as a pretended Church officer ſuch as 1. appropriating the term *Epiſcopus* common to all Paſtors, to a Prelat. The abſurdity of this diſcovered Calvines remarkeable Teſtimony on Titus 1: 7. page 4. 2 making it *relate to Paſtors* which hath *the flock* for its *immediat object*. Cleared from 1 Pet. 5: 3. Invading and nulling the Authority allowed to Presbyters. The matter of fact cleared from the principles of Prelatiſts and the abſurdity hereof from ſeverall Scripture grounds page 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. 11, 12. 4. Impeaching Chriſts Kingly office as head of his Church and the perfection of his word in obtruding an officer on his Church of a different mould from thoſe deſcribed and allowed by him cleared from the nature of the prelats office and ſome Scripture grounds page 13, 14, 15.

### Chap. 2. page 16.

Some more Arguments againſt the Dioceſian Prelat: that his office *debaſes the acts and exerciſe of the power of order*, cleared from the matter of fact and Severall Scripture grounds page 16, 17, 18. It maimes and diverſifies the Paſtorall office, by Anti-Scripturall new


 invented

invented degrees thereof cleared at large page 19, 20 His office many wayes contrare to thevery nature of the gospell Church Government, cleard also at large from the nature of the Prelats office and several Scripture grounds page 21, 22, 23, 24.

## Cap. 3, page 25.

The Diocesian Bishops office *debases extraordinary offices, in confounding them with ordinary*, cleared from the Scripture-account of these extraordinary offices, and the nature of the Prelats office, according to the principles and pleading of the Episcopall party. Pag 25, 26, 27, 28, 29. 30. The derivation of the Prelats office from the Apostolical Authority and the power of Timothy and Titus, loaded with absurdities. ibid.

## Chap. 4. page 30.

The Diocesian Prelats office takes away the *peoples right to call their Pastor.* This right proved from Scripture and divine reason page 31, 32, 33. It excludes the office of the *ruling elder* proved from the practice of Prelatists as likewayes the preceeding charge the divine right of this office proved from several Scripture grounds, especially 1 Tim. 5: 17. And some chief exceptions of the prelatick party examined Page 34, 35, 36, 37, 38.

## Chap. 5. page 39.

That the present Prelacy is *grosse Erastianisme*, proved, from the matter of fact, some Arguments against it under that notion. It excludes and denyes all Church Government in the hands of Church officers

cers distinct from the civill; contrary to the Churches priviledge both under the Old and New Testament, which is demonstrat at large. Page 41, 42, 43, 44, Is in many points ane incroachment upon the liberties of the gospel Church and upon Christs mediatory Authority over the same; which is cleared page 45, 46.

## Chap. 6: page 47.

Erastianisme denyes the *compleat constitution of the Apostolick Church in point of Government.* Removes the Scripture land marks, set to distinguish the civil and Ecclesiastick powers, which is cleared in several points page 47, 48, 49, 50. It is lyable to great absurdities ibid.

## Chap. 7. pag. 51.

The Informers shifting and obscuring the true state of the question anent Episcopacy, and flinching from the point debateable discovered several wayes page 52, 53 He declines a direct pleading for the Prelats civill offices, yet offers some arguments in defence thereof wherin his prevarication and contradiction to himself is made appear. His pretended Scripture Arguments from the Instances of Eli and Samuel, and the Priests concurrence in that Court 11 Numb. to fortify the Prelats civil state offices, ad examined page 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59. He is contradicted by *interpreters* in this point, Antiquity full and clear against him. The grounds of the Assembly 1638 Sess. 25. Against the civill offices of Ministers page 63, 64. The *Informers* endeavours to bring in the *Diocesian Bishop* under that command of *decency* and *order* as *lawfull* though not *com-*

The Contents
*manded and neceſſary.* That the Biſhop cannot be warranted on this ground but muſt as a ſuppoſed Church officer, inſtruct his inſtitution; and miſſion from Scripture, cleared from ſeveral Scripture grounds and the acknowledgment of ſome adverſaries page 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73.

ap.
Ch 8. page 73. miſprinted Chap. 9.

The *Informer* undertakes to anſwer the Arguments of Presbyterians againſt Epiſcopacy, his anſwers to our Arguments from Matth. 22: 25, 26. Wherin having miſrepreſented it, he is notwithſtanding forced to embrace the evaſions of Papiſts, falls in diverſe inconſiſteneies, and walks croſſe to the ſence of ſound divines upon this Text: Yea of ſome of the ancients which cleard at large page 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82. his anſwer to our Argument from 1 Pet. 5: 3. Wherein he alſo offers violence to the text and joines iſſue with the Papiſts, his evaſions examined and this Text (as alſo the preceding) Improven againſt him page 84, 85, 86, 87, 88.

Chap. 9. miſprinted Chap. 10. page 88.

The Informers Anſwers to our Argument from acts 20. and Titus 1: 5, 7. Theſe Texts emproven againſt him, and his anſwers fully examined page 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96. His anſwers to our Argument from Philip. 1: 1. His abſurd and inconſiſtent ſhifts diſcovered and confuted page 98, 99, 100, 101, 102. *Arnoldus* and *Chamier* do claſſe him with the Papiſts in his anſwers to this text, he walks croſſe to the Dutch, and Engliſh Annotations, and to Calvin. page 103, 104,

104, 105. His answers to our Argument from Ephes. 4: 11. Examined page 106, 107, 108.

## Chap. 10. misprinted Chap. 12. page 109.

The *Informer* offers Scripture warrand for Bishops. His Argument from the *Government of the Church under the old Testament*, the subordination of the Priests and Levites. The remoteness and absurdity of his consequence anent the lawfulnesse of the present diocesian Erastian Prelats office, as it is deduced from this principle, discovered several wayes, page 110, 111, 112. That there is no image of our Prelacy in the Jewish Church Government, cleared, The *Informer* walks crosse to *Junius*, yea Bishop Bilson himself, and in the series of his reasoning, introduces a pope into the Christian Church, page 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120. His Argument from the *Apostles superiority to the 70 disciples*, examined. He begs the question in supposing Prelats to succeed the Apostles immediately, and Pastors the 70 Disciples, and from a superiority among officers of *different kindes*, groundlesly concludes a superiority among officers of the *same kind*. No Image of our prelacy in the Apostles superiority over other Church officers, page 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126.

## Chap. 11. misprinted Chap. 10. page 127.

The *Informers* great Argument for Prelacy from the *pretended Episcopacy of Timothy and Titus*. Their Episcopall office disproved, from the office of *Evangelist*, ascribed expresly to the one, and by good consequence to the other, from many circumstances of the sacred text, and the judgment of interpreters. page 128 129, (misprinted 127,) 130 (misprinted 128) 131. (misprinted 129.) The Informers answers anent the strict

and large ſenſe of an Evangeliſt, his reaſons of denying to Timothy, the Evangeliſtick office in a *ſtrict ſenſe*, examined: and found inconſiſtent with themſelves, and contrare to Scripture, 132, (miſprinted 130) 133 miſprinted 131, (134 miſprinted 132) 135 (miſprinted 133,) 136, miſprinted 134, 137 miſprinted 135, 138 (miſprinted 136) he denies the power in ordination and Juriſdiction to be the proper work of an Evangeliſt. How abſurdly and inconſiſtently page 139, 140 (miſprinted 137, 138) his contradiction to *Saravia* diſcovered in ſeverall points page 141, 142 (miſprinted 139, 140) 143 (miſprinted 151). His anſwer to the Doubters Argument anent Timotheus his not being fixed at Epheſus, but occaſionally left there examined, as alſo his anſwer to that Exception of the Doubter [anent Pauls giving the Epiſcopal charge to the elders of Epheſus, not to Timothy] our Informer pityfully bruilied with this Text, page 144, 145, 146, 147, 148 (miſprinted 142, 143, 144. 145, 146) he walks croſſe to Biſhop Hal, Dounham and Hooker, to Chryſoſtome, Jerome, Theodorus. His grounds upon which he pleads for Timothy and Titus their Epiſcopal power, particularly examined. the firſt taken from *Pauls giving direction to Timothy and Titus, how to cary in ordination and Juriſdiction*, generally examined page 149, 150, (miſprinted 146, 147) his arguing from theſe directions particularly examined anent their *not laying on of hands ſuddenly*, anent *rebuke and cenſures*. page 151, 152 (miſprinted 148, 149) the *Informers* next Argument, from the *concernment of after ages in theſe rulers*. That neither this, nor the adreſsing of theſe rulers to the Evangeliſts will affoord any help unto him, cleared. The London Miniſters vindicat. That Timothy and Titus power at Epheſus and Crete, *was not voided after ſome elders were ordained there*, a ſandy foundation to ſupport their Epiſcopacy. The *Informer*

*former* is pitifully in the bryars, in answering his Doubters exception anent *Timothies ordination, by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery. The practice of after ages* a ground to support the Episcopacy of Timothy and Titus 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169. (misprinted 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166.)

Chap. 12. misprinted Chap. 11. according to the misprinted Method (which shall be followed hereafter except in some few pages) page 167.

The *Informers* pleadings for Prelacy from the *seven Asian Angells*, discussed. That the *stile of prophetick* writings and of this book do strongly conclude a *collective sense* in the term, *Angel*, proved by several Arguments page 168, 169, 170. Whatever he can alledge is the Characteristick of this angel, proved to be in Scripture apropriat to Ministers. page 171. Many divines ancient and modern for the collective sense of the Word (*Angel*), yea some episcopal men themselves, page 172, 173. The admitting of the *Angel* to be one single person will nothing help the *Informer*, page 173, 174. His answer to the exception from Rev. 2: 24. examined. Ibid. His Argument from the pretended *Testimonies of the ancients* and the *Catalogues of succeeding Bishops*. examined. Page 175, 176, 177, 178. The *addressing of the Epistle to the Angel.* Will not help him. as neither Doctor Reynolds, nor Beza their taking the Angel for a single person. Page 178, 179, 180, 181. The *Informers* new Argument for prelacy [taken for *Diotrephes his love of preheminence*] wherein he embraces Bellarmines evasions, and offers violence

to this, and parallel texts page 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187.

Chap 13. misprinted Chap. 12. page 187.

The *Informers* appeal to *Antiquity* in the point of Episcopacy. That *Antiquity* is not the Judge in this debate, although he could instruct the matter of fact, proved. Page 188, 189, 190, 191. The Scripture (even by the Confession of the Fathers) the only judge in matters of faith and practice, not Custome and Antiquity. Ibid. The *Informers* reasoning on this head reduced to a formal syllogism. The Major proposition, the Informer though oblidged offers no proof of. It is scannd, and likewayes the assumption; and the unsoundnesse of both discovered. Page 192, 193, 194. 195, 196. The *Informers* Arguments from the *Catalogues of Bishops*, largely scannd, and the insufficiey thereof discovered, in the Judgement of sound divines. Several things do invalidat *Eusebius* Testimony. page 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202. That the first pureſt Chuch was governed by Presbyters without Bishops. Jeroms Testimony in his commentary upon Titus, and the Epistle to Evagrius, for the Identity of [Bishop] and [Presbyter], and a Presbyteriall Government in the Apostolick times, largely vindicated from the exceptions of this Informer, which are discovered to offer violence to Jeromes Words, to be inconsistentent with themselves, and contrary to that sense of Jeromes Testimony which is exhibit by learned Protestant divines, yea some adversarys themselves. Page 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 316, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222,

Chap.

## Chap. 14, misprinted Chap. 13 page 223.

The difference betwixt our *present Prelacy*, and the *ancient Episcopacy*, stated and evinced in many points. Such as 1: *The power of ordination and Jurisdiction above Presbyters*, cleared in several particulars. And from the Testimony of the Ancients, and eminent Protestant divines. Chrysostomes Testimony on 1 Tim. 1. Homely 11. explaind. 2. *That they were set up by the Presbyters free choice and election.* Proved from Antiquity 3. *In reference to the peoples Interest in their choyce.* 4. *That they could not, ordain alone.* 5. *That they did not invade Presbyters decisive suffrage.* Cleared also from Antiquity, page 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231. 6. In the point of their *civil state-offices*; which is proved to be contrary to the canons called *Apostolick*, & other canons of ancient Councills. 7. That *metropolitan Primacy* is a stranger to antiquity, also cleared. 8. So likewayes *Erastian Prelacy*, page 232, 233, 234. 9. Our Prelats *exclusion of the ruling elder from Church Judicatories* crosses Antiquity. 10. Their *large and Provincial inspection.* 11. Their laying aside the *preaching of the Gospell*, renders them Monsters to pure Antiquity, and exposes them to the censure of Ancient Canons page 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242. 12. In their *fastuous pomp and sumptuous grandeur* ibid.

## Chap. 15, misprinted Chap. 14. page 243

The *Informers* pretended Testimonyes out of Calvin, Beza, Blondell &c. For Episcopacy, examined. Their Anti-episcopall Judgement cleard from their

ings, particularly Calvines, from his Commentaries upon the controverted Scriptures in this point, ſeverall paſſages of his Inſtitutions and Commentaries vindicated. page 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251. As alſo of ſome Epiſtles page 252, 253, 254. As alſo of Beza page 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 360. The *Informers* two abſurdities which by way of a *Dilemma* he offers unto us from our aſſertion of the *unalterableneſſe of Presbyterian Government*, and our conceſſion of a *Proeſtos early brought in*, ſcannd and retorted upon himſelf. Page 260, 261, 262, 263. Some paſſages of Blondel vindicated, and of Chamier, and Moulin, page 264, 265, 266, 267, 268. (miſprinted 236) the Authors of *jus divinum Miniſterii anglicani* vindicated at ſome length, and in ſpecial from imputations of a *contradiction* impoſed upon them by the *Informer*, page 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274 (miſprinted 237, 238, 262, 263, 264) a paſſage of Bucer vindicate ibid.

Chap. 16. miſprinted 15. page 275. (miſprinted 265.

Severall Teſtimonyes of the fathers offered by Mr Durham in his commentary upon the revelation, for evincing the identity of *Angel, Bishop and Presbyter*, vindicated from the exceptions of the *Informer* his Exception to Mr Durhames teſtimony of Auguſtine examined, as likewayes to that of Ambroſe and Chryſoſtome. Page 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, (miſprinted 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271) the Informers inconſiſtences noted, page 281, 282, 283 (miſprinted 271, 272, 273.)

Chap.

Chap. 17. misprinted 16. page 284. (misprinted 274.)

The Harmonious consent of *ancient fathers*, *modern divines* and *confessions of reformed Churches*, for Presbyterian Government in its essential points of difference from Prelacy, exhibit. 1. *That there is no diffence betwixt a bishop and Presbyter Jure divino.* Page 285, 286, 287 (misprinted 275, 276, 277. 2. *In their point of ordination & jurisdiction that these are not in the hand of a single prelat, but that Presbyters have essentiall joint-interest therein* page 288, 289, 290 (misprinted 278, 279, 280.) 3. In point of *the peoples interest in the election and call of Ministers.* Page 290, 291 (misprinted 280, 281) 4. In relation to the *ruling elder, as appointed by Christ.* Page 292 (misprinted 282) 5. As it stands in opposition to Erastian principles and the present prelacy in that respect, and maintains a spirituall Authority in the hands of Church officers, distinct from, & independent upon, the civil powers of the world, ibid.

# SECOND PART.

## Chap. 1. pag. 2.

A Twofold state of the question proposed, the one touching the abjuration of this Prelacy in either or both Covenants, the other concerning the obligation of these Oaths against it. That prelacy is abjured in the national Covenant, proved from severall clauses of it, page 3, 4, 5, 6, That it is also abjured in the solemn league and Covenant, proved from several passages thereof, and the then state of our Church. page

page 7,8,9,10. The ſtanding force of theſe Oaths upon the preſent and ſucceeding generations proved. 1. from their nature and eſſence, page 11, 12, 13. 2. From the ſubject they affect. 3. Their matter and object. 4. Their end and ſcope, and even as to Presbyterian Government, page 13, 14.

Chap. 2. page 16,

The Informers Arguments againſt abjuration of Prelacy in the National Covenant. Some reaſons of his againſt an Oath in general, or this Oaths obligation upon the poſterity, weighed, page 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 Mr Croftons Teſtimony (in his Analepſis) for the obligation of the Covenant upon the poſterity, page 21, 22. The Informers reaſons againſt the abjuration of prelacy in the National Covenant, examined. The Author of the Apologetical relation vindicated, together with the Aſſembly 1638. page 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41.

Chap. 3. page 42.

The Abjuration of Prelacy in the ſolemne league and Covenant vindicat from the exceptions of the Informer. The Informer alledges it is only the Engliſh Prelacy that the Covenant oblidges againſt, how impertinently, cleared. page 43, 44, 45. That Timorcus affords no help to him in this anſwer, cleard ibid. Nor Mr Crofton, which is alſo cleard; page 46, 47, 48, 49, 50. From ſeveral paſſages of Mr Crofton in his Analepſis. The Covenant excludes our Prelacy, and oblidges to Presbyterian Government in his principles, proved ibid. His objection anent [the ſenſe of the 2 Article offered by the Parliament of England] Anſwered. As

ed. As alſo his Exceptions to our Argument taken from our obligation [to preſerve the Government of the Church of Scotland] page 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59. His fancied contradiction which he imputes to us as to the ſenſe of the firſt and ſecond article, refuted. The Informer ſtands in oppoſition to Mr Crofton. The ſenſe of the Engliſh Presbyterians as to the firſt Article not different from our own, ibid. That the Engliſh Presbyterians did looke upon themſelves, as oblidged to reform according to our pattern, which is the Scripture pattern, proved at large from ſeveral paſſages of Mr Crofton page 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, The Informers allegeance [that the firſt Article is ambiguous, and that our Church and ſtate being but a part of the impoſers of the Oath, their ſenſe cannot determine its meaning] vain and impertinent. pag 65, 66, 67,

## Chap. 4. page 67.

The grounds upon which the Informer undertakes to prove that the obligation of the Covenant ceaſeth, although its oblidging force for the time paſt, were ſuppoſed, examined. He begs a ſuppoſition of the indifferency of prelacy, how poorly and impertinently cleard, page 68, 69, 70. His firſt ground taken from [the command and authority of Rulers] generally conſidered, and found impertinent to ſupport his concluſion, though his ſuppoſition were granted. page 71, 72. His 2d ground touching [the alteration of the matter ſworn] as alſo his third taken from [the hinderance of a greater good, by the performance] reſolving (in his ſenſe) wholly upon the Magiſtrates command, abſurd when applyed, to our caſe which is fully cleared. page 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78. His abſurd and inconſiſtent rea-

ſoning about a [ greater command overruling the leſſe] and our obligation to obey the rulers, as prior to that of the Covenant. page 7. ibid. alſo page 79, 80. His Argument taken from Num: 30. examined at large he contradicts Caſuiſts, and the text hath manifold incoſiſtencies in his reaſoning, while reſolving all his rules into the Magiſtrates lawes, the Informers rules pleaded againſt him, and according to the mould of his ple ding doth caſt dirt upon the Magiſtrate. page 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86. His impertinent repetitions, ſome further abſurdities wherewith his Explication of the ſecond rule in reference to the Magiſtrate is lyable. page 87, 88. His Argument from Eccleſ. 8: 20. weighed. page 89, 90. His limitations of the third rule anent the Oaths hindering a greater good, reſolving ſtill upon the command of the powers, abſurd, and contradicted by Caſuiſts, and many wayes croſſes his deſign and pleading, cleared at large, page 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96. His reflection upon Miniſters in leaving their charge, examined, as alſo his Arguments from the Rechabites. page 97, 98, 99.

## Chap. 5, page 99.

The Informers anſwer to our Argument for the Covenant obligation taken from the Oath to the Gibeonites. His trifling way of moulding our Argument. And in what ſenſe wee plead this paſſage. page 100, 101. The Informers abſurdity which he endeavours to faſten upon us in this Argument viz: [ that an Oath can bind againſt a command of God, impertinent to the point, and ſuch as the Informer himſelf ſtands obliged to anſwer, in maintaining the Authority of the ſacred text. page 102, 103. he is contradicted by Jackſonand, inconſiſtent with himſelf in this point. Page 104.

104, 105. the violence which he offers to that paſſage Deut. 20: 10. diſcovered and cleared from Interpreters, and many circumſtances of the ſacred text and parallel Scriptures. page 106, 107, 108, 109, 110. His groſſe and fooliſh diſtinguiſhing in this tranſaction of Joſhua. the league and the peace diſcovered. page ibid. as alſo his oppoſition to learned interpreters here. He ſuppoſes, but doth not prove a limitation in Gods command to cutt of the Canaanites. His abſurd ſuppoſition that Joſhua brake his league with them when he know them to be ſuch. page 111, 112. his inſtance anent Rahab to prove the limitation of Gods command to deſtroy the Canaanites conſidered and emproven againſt him. As alſo his Argument from the 11 of Joſhua 19 examined. And Solomons impoſing bond ſervants upon theſe nations pleads nothing for him. page 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119. The manyfold inconſiſtencies of his anſwers upon this point obſerved. page 120, 121, 122, 123, 124. The impertinency of all he anſwers upon this point though granted. His anſwers to our Arguments from Zedekiahs Oath to the King of Babylon, examined. As alſo to the Argument taken from Pſal. 15: 4, Page 125, 126, 127, 128. His reflection on the Aſſembly 1638. In declaring the nullity of the Oaths of the Intrants under Prelats, groundleſſe and impertinent to the point, ibid. His argument offered by way of retorſion [ Comiſſaries though abjured in the Covenant are owned by us, and why may not alſo *Biſhops* without hazard of perjury ] largely ſcannd. The vaſt difference betwixt the one and the other practice cleared in ſeveral points, both in reſpect of the officers owned and of the manner of owning them page 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136.

THIRD

## The Contents

# THIRD PART

### Chap. 1, pag. 2.

THe queſtion ſtated and cleared, from our Churches ſtate before, and ſince the introduction of prelacy; and the different condition of Presbyterian Miniſters and Conformiſts page 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. The different grounds which the presbyterian and prelatick party (and this man particularly) plead upon, for the peoples adherence exhibited. [Separation] in many caſes not [Schiſm.] The many groundleſſe ſuppoſitions that this charge of [Schiſme] is founded upon, exhibit, and cleared page 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. The ſtate of the queſtion largely drawen forth upon a true account of the matter of fact, and of our principles, and Arguments offered to acquit this practice of the charge of [Schiſme], ſuch as 1 That the Presbyterian party are this true Church. 2. That they are under no obligation to joyn to the prelatick intereſt. 3, They have a ground of retorſion of all that is pleaded by the prelatick party on this point. 4. The Covenant obligation engadges to the practice controverted; which is cleared in ſeverall particulars, page 13, 14, 15, 16, 17. 5. It falls under Scripture-obligations, which is cleared in ſeveral particulars page 18 19, 20, 21. 6. That the Prelatick party will be found in their perſecution, the grand renters and dividers of this Church. 7. This practice controverted hath nothing of the ingredients of a ſinfull ſeparation from this Church which is cleared in 7 particulars at large, page 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28. Finally this practice cannot be that [Schiſme] abjured in the Covenant. The Informers Argument hereanent emproven againſt him and that

that the diſowning of presbyterian Miniſters falls under the imputation of ſuch a Schiſme, cleared page 27, 28, 29.

## Chap. 2, page 29.

The Informers charge of [internall Schiſme] upon nonconformiſts, his Elogies of Schiſm, and Teſtimony of Cyprian conſidered, and this charge [retorted upon him page 30, 31, 32, 33. His charge of condemning all Churches for a thouſand years who have owne Biſhops, liturgies &c.] examined, found groundleſſe, and impertinent to the point. His Argument from Rom 14. Examined and retorted upon him. His charge of [Externall Schiſme] in ſeparating in acts of Worſhip, fortified by that paſſage Heb. 10: 25, Examined, page 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42. The doubters argument from 1 Cor. 12: v. 31. [that wee ought to ſeeke the beſt & moſt edifying gifts] advantageouſly for himſelf, but fraudulently, propoſd by the Informer. Conſiderations to clear and enforce this Argument. The Informers anſwers examined at large page 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 42, His Argument for adhering to Conformiſts taken from the reciprocall tye betwixt a Miniſter and people Ezek. 33: 8. Heb. 13: 17. Mal. 2. 7. 1 Theſſ. 5: 11, 12. As alſo from Mr Durham on the revelation page 105, 106. examined at large, page 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59. the premiſed texts improven againſt Conformiſts plea from this ſuppoſed tye and relation. ibid.

Chap.

## Chap. 3, page 58.

The doubters argument from Curats not entering by a call from the people, and that paſſage Acts 14: 23. cleared and emproven. page 59, 60, 61, 62, 63. The Informers firſt anſwer, that ſeveral whom we refuſed to own, entered by this call. ibid. his exception upon the term χειροτονησαντες examined. his firſt anſwer touching the uſe of the word, to expreſſe the action of one ſingle perſon, proved from Acts 10: 41. examined. the uſe of the word cleared from parallels, criticks and Interpreters. page 64, 65, 66. His ſecond Anſwer, that Greek writers uſe this Word to ſignifie ordination without ſuffrages, and that this was the action of Paul and Barnabas, examined. The granting that this was the action of Paul and Barnabas, diſtinct from the Churches ſuffrage, will not help the Informer. Page 67, 68, 69. He walks croſſe to interpreters in this anſwer page. 70, 71, 72. His third anſwer [that wee will thus give advantage to independants for popular election of Miniſters] examined, wherein the difference betwixt the independents and us in this point is cleared, from the Judgement and principles of Presbyterian writers. page 73, 74, 75, 76, 77. His laſt anſwer is that if wee diſown Conformiſts for want of this call we null the Miniſtry of the Chriſtian world for above a thouſand years & upward, and the Miniſtry of this Church to the year 1649. examined, even the later Antiquity clear for this call, by the teſtimony of Marcus Antonius de *Dominis* the Council of Paris anno 559, the examples of Eradius, Ambroſe &c. Yea of Biſhop Bilſone. page 78, 79, 80, 81. That patronages are abjured in the Covenant, cleared

cleared againſt the Informer, and his exception anent our Churches perjury, becauſe of the uſe of patronages after the Covenant, repelled. In what ſenſe the prelatick ordination is pleaded by us in diſowning conformiſts. of the term, *Curat.* The Informer honeſtly grants that it ſignifyes one who ſerves the cure, though not the Miniſter of the place, but the ſubſtitute of another. page 82, 83, 84, 85. His anſwer anent the charge of Perjury, and reaſoning anent the lawfulneſſe of diſowning Miniſters, becauſe of Scandals, who are not cenſured, examined. His reaſoning found frivolous, and retorted upon him. page 86, 87, 88. his great argument from Math. 23. Anent the ſuppoſed command of hearing the Scribes and Phariſees, examined. Several circumſtances of the ſacred text offered to diſcover, how very difficult, it is to prove that there is a command of hearing them, as Church officers. The conſequence from hearing of them, though granted, to the hearing of them, denyed upon five grounds: As alſo his reaſoning from Simeon & Anna, Joſeph and Mary their attending the Temple-Worſhip, examined. page 89, 90, 91, 92, 93. Mr Durham on Revel. 3. pleads nothing for the Informer in this point. page 94, 95, 96. His reaſons to prove there is a command of hearing Matth. 23. as above deſcribed, examined and repelled. page 97 ſeveral anſwers of the Informer to our charge of intruſion and the queries that he propones thereupon; as alſo his retorſion upon this charge, examined and found vain and frivolous. page 98, 99, 100, 101, 102. His anſwers to the doubters Argument anent the abjuration of Epiſcopall Miniſters in the Covenant as dependent upon the hierarchy confuted. His retorſion [that wee were bound upon this ground to diſown all the Miniſters at the taking of the Covenant, who hadbeen ordained by Prelats, unleſſe they renounced their ordination]

dination] ane empty knack, reflecting on the reformed Churches, & juſtifying the popes plea againſt them; page 103, 104, 105.

Chap. 4, page 105,

The Informers anſwer to the doubters Argument anent [ſeparation from a corrupt Church.] In what reſpects and how far this ſeparation is owned. His anſwer anent [the not ſeparating from the Churches of Corinth and Galatia, and the aſian Churches Rev. 2: 3. Though tainted with moſt groſſe corruptions &c:] examined. The diſcrepancy of our caſe from theirs in this point cleard in ſome particulars, and our cauſe fortified from Scripture directions to theſe Churches, page 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113. The impertinency of theſe inſtances to our caſe, cleared from hence ſeveral wayes, ibid. The Informers anſwer to theſe Scriptures 2 Cor. 6: 14, 15, 16. 1 Cor. 5: 11, 2. Theſs. 3: 6. Rev. 18: 3. Examined, and found contradictory to his conceſſion anent [a neceſſary ſeparation from a corrupt Church], when highly corrupted] page 114, 115, 116, 117. His anſwer to the retorted charge of Schiſme upon Conformiſts [for ſeperating from this Church, examined, and found naught: He therein cuts the ſinnewes of his arguing againſt us, page 118, 119, 120. His anſwer and reaſoning concerning *lecturing* examined. God never appointed a dumb reading, the Levites gave the ſenſe of the Law &c. the exceptions anent [the diſuſe of our firſt Method of lecturing] and [the want of Circumciſion and the paſsover for a conſiderable time in the Jewiſh Church] help him not in this point, page 121, 122, 123, 124, 125.

Chap.

## Chap: 5. page 126.

The Informers anſwer and reaſoning upon the point of ſcandal and offence, in reference to the owning of Conformiſts conſidered. The Informers groundleſſe ſuppoſition anent the duty of hearing Conformiſts. Our Orthodox ſenſe of Rom 14. and 1 Cor. 8. in the point of Scandal, cleard at large from the expoſition of Chryſoſtome on the firſt text, and Pareus on the ſecond. page 126, 127, 128, 129; 130, 131, 132, 133. The Informer upon ſuppoſition that a practice is lawfull, and offence flowes from it, holds that the command of the powers will looſe the giver of offence from guilt; and remove this liberty of the practice and the nature of offence, how abſurdly, cleared in fyve points. page 134, 135, 136, 138. He is herein contradicted by Ameſius. The inſtances of the Brazen ſerpent, and Gideons ephod improven againſt him, ibid. His abſurd gloſſe upon Acts 15: 28. [that the things before indifferent were made neceſſary by the meere determination of the Concil,] largely repelled. Calvin claſſes him with the Papiſts herein. His manifold inconſiſtencies obſerved, and abſurd expoſition of [*ſcandalum acccptum*] and [*datum*] which do deſtroy that diſtinctione. Mr Gilleſpie (Eng: Pop: Cerem:) Ameſ: (Conſc: Lib: 5. Cap. 11.) Mr Durham (on Scandal part 3. Chap 1) diſcover the futility of his doctrine on this head. page 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144. The Doubters Argument for presbyterian Miniſters preaching in the manner contraverted, taken from [Chriſt and his Apoſtles preaching in the fields and houſes.] The Informers general anſwer [anent Chriſts not ſeparating people from the Synagogue] weighed and found frivolous. page 145, 146, 147. Some ſpecial

 reaſons

reasons wherefore our Lord did not separate the people from the Synagogue, ibid. The special grounds of our Lords practice, offred by him to enervat our Argument, considered and Answered. Such as his bringing in the doctrine of the Gospell as the Messiah, his being head of the whole Church page 148, 149, 150, 151. What actions of our Lord were mitable. Rules hereanent (allowed by sound divines) applyed to the case and practice controverted. [That the law allowes the gospell to be preached purely, and faithfully by some] though granted to the Informer, will help him nothing, ibid. The Informers answers and exceptions to our argument from Acts 14: 19. examined. His answer from the Apostles extraordinary call friolous, as also from the tendency of the rulers prohibition to silence gospell page 152, 153, 154, 155. His reasoning upon Solomons thrusting out Abiathar from the priesthood, examined; as also his citation of Bezaes letter to the Non-Conformists in England. Page 156' 157.

## Chap: 6. page 159.

The nature of Presbyterian Ministers relation to this Church, and their call to officiate therein, vindicat from the Informers simple cavils. Mr Rutherfoord and Mr Durhames acknowledgement that a Minister is not made a Catholick Minister of the Catholick Chnrch but by his ordination restricted to a flock, will not help the Informer, which is cleard in six points: page 159, 160, 161, 162 His Dilemma which he offers to us viz: that our call to preach, is either ordinary or extraorninary answered & retorted upon him. His Cavills in relationall to the Acts of Councils condemning this encroachment (as he calls it) and the Doctors of Aberdeen their charging Pres-

Presbyterian Ministers therewith, repelled, ibid. His charge anent [our ordaining others to perpetuat our Schisme] a manifest groundlesse calumny. page 163, 164. His passage cited out of Mr Baxters preface to the cure of Church divisions, answered, page 165, as also his 5 healing advices to his half-proselyted Doubter. page 65, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170. Mr Baxters rules in his cure of Church divisions which he after commends unto us, shortly viewed, & their impertinency to his purpose discovered. page 171, 172, 173, 174. his testimonies out of the *jus divinum Ministerii anglicani*, and of Mr Rutherfoord in his due right of Presbytery anent unwarrantable separation, insufficient to bear the weight of his conclusion. The difference between the case they speake to, and our case cleared in 4. Considerations, page 175, 176, 177. His citations from the first author particularly considered, and their insufficiency to bear the weight of his conclusion discovered. page 178, 179, 180, 181, The citations of Mr Rutherford particularly examined in so far as relating to his scope. page 182, 183, 184, 185 186, 187. In his citations from both these authors, and arguing therefrom, he is found inconsistent with himself, to walk upon groundlesse suppositions, and lyable to a manifest retorsion. ibid. The Informer drawes out no conclusion upon these citations, save this general one at the close viz: That real, much lesse supposed corruptions in the Worship, or administrators will not warrand separation. The impertinency of this position to help him cleard, ibid. He pleads for retractions, and presents at the close a character of Schisme, which is retorted against him page 187, 188.

## The Cntents third Part

### Chap: 7. misprinted Chap: 6. page 189.

Animadversions upon the Informers preface and title page, prefixed to this Pamphlet. He pretendes conscience & a design of union in this undertaking, how unsoundly, discovered. page 189, 190. 191. His Testimonies out of Zanchy and Blondel to evince their approbation of Prelacy, left by him untranslated, (though he pretends for the advantadge of the English reader to translate all other testimonies) answered.

A
Confutation
*Of the First*
# DIALOGUE,
Upon the point
*Of*
# EPISCOPACIE.

*Wherein it is demonſtrat, that the Epiſcopacie now exiſtent, both in its Dioceſian & Eraſtian cutt, is contrare to the Scripture, to the firſt and purer Antiquitie, the Doctrine and Confeſſions of Reformed Churches & ſound Divines. And the Informer's Reaſonings for it, from Scripture & Antiquitie, are weighed, and found wanting.*

A CHAP.

## Chap. I.

*That the Prelat, now established in this Church, is both Diocesian and Erastian, cleared. The Informer is engaged to defend both. A twofold State of the Question propounded accordingly. Some Arguments from Scripture against the Diocesian Prelat, as a pretended Church-officer. Such as,* 1. *Perverting the Scriptural term,* Episcopus, *commune to all Pastors; in appropriating it to a Prelat.* 2. *Making it relate to Pastors, which hath the flock for its immediat object.* 3. *Invading & nulling the Authority allowed unto Presbyters, which is demonstrat at large.* 4. *Impeaching Christs Kingly office, as Head of his Church, and the perfection of his Word, in obtruding ane Officer upon the Church, of a different mould from those described and allowed by him.*

THE *state* of the *first Question* in the first Conference is, *whither the Episcopacie now established by Law in* Scotland, *be warranted or condemned by the Word of God.* For clearing this, it must be understood, what that Prelacie is, which is now existent, and which this Author pretends is consonant to Scripture and Antiquitie. As to matter of fact, it is undenyable. 1. That the Parliament 1662. did expresly raze Presbyterian government, in all its preexistent Courts, Judicatories and Privileges, declaring it voide and expired. 2. They did Redintegrat the Bishops

shops [ to their Episcopal function, presidencie in the Church, power of ordination and censures, and all Church discipline to be performed by them, with advice (*only*) and of such of the Clergie (*only*) as they shall find, (they themselves being judges) of knowne Loyaltie and prudence.] And they redintegrat them to all the pretended Privileges possessed be them in Anno 1637. What time their power was at the greatest height. Since, of themselves they framed the Book of Canons, which doth establish their sole power and dominion over all Church Judicatories, razing classical Presbyteries and Parochial Sessions, and drew up the Liturgie and Book of Ordination without the least shaddow of advice from this Church; Threatning even excommunication against the opposers of that course. 3. It is also evident, that all this Power and Authoritie of our Prelats, is fountained in, derived from, and referable unto the Supremacie; As is evident by the Act restoring Prelacie, after the declaration of the Supremacie, as his Majesties Commissioners in the exercise of his Ecclesiastick Government, and, in the administration of all their pretended spiritual Authoritie, as accountable to him, their Head and supreme *Legislator* in all Church matters. Hence, it is evident, that this Author is obliged (if he would answer his undertaking in pleading for the present Prelacie) not only to evince the warrantablenes of the *Diocesian Bishop* in all his pretended spiritual power over Church Judicatories; But likewayes of the *Erastian-bishop*, deriving all his Authoritie from the Civil Magistrat.

Wee shall then (befor wee come to examine his pleading upon this Head) offer, 1. Some Arguments against our Diocesian Prelat, as a pretended Church-officer, and shall shew his office to be contrare to Scripture. 2. As ane Eraftian Prelat deryving all his spiritual power from

the Magistrat. *I.* As a pretended Church officer, the Diocesian Bishop is contrare to Scripture, in many respects.

I. In narrowing and restricting the Scripture term ἐπίσκοπος to ane office and officer, distinct from, and Superior to, a Presbyter or Pastor. For since the Spirit of God in Scripture appropriats this term to Presbyters, and consequentlie the work and office therin imported, Tit. 1: 5, 7. Act. 20: 28. 1 Pet. 5: 2. 3. Sure it must be ane anti-Scriptural and Sacrilegius robbing of Presbyters of their right and due designation, to make this proper and peculiar to a Diocesian Bishop onlie, as the Characteristick of his office. Episcopal men themselves (and this Author particularely) doe acknowledge this term to be in Scripture applyed to Presbyters. Let them then shew a reason why they have made it peculiar to a Prelat as distinct from Presbyters; Or, let them shew where the word ἐπίσκοπος denots such ane officer as they have shappen out (viz.) A diocesian Prelat having sole power of ordination and jurisdiction over a wholl dioces, with a negative voice and a sole decisive suffrage in the Church Judicatories thereof. Should they appropriat the term *Pastor*, or *Minister*, to a diocesian Prelat onlie? Who would not call this ane Anti-scriptural usurpation of the Presbyters due? And why also, shall it not be thought such ane usurpation when they appropriat the term *Episcopus* or *Bishop*, to such a pretended distinct officer; Since this term is as much given to Presbyters in Scripture, as the terme of *Pastor* or *Minister*. Judicious Calvin hath some remarkable passages to this purpose in his Comentaries. On Tit 1: 7. Having observed that Bishops and Presbyters are all one, He calls the appropriating of the name, *Bishop*, to the Prelat, a profane boldnes and ane abrogating of the holy Ghosts language *Abrogato Spiritus Sancti sermone usus hominum arbitrio induc-*

*tus*

*Elus prævaluit —— nomen officii quod Deus in commune omnibus dederat in unum transferri reliquis spoliatis & injurium est & absurdum. Deinde sic pervertere Spiritus sancti linguam —— nimis profanæ audaciæ est.* Act. 20: 28. He collects the identitie of the name & office of Bishop & Presbiter, from the elders being called Bishops, And having observed the same on Philip. 1. And that after, the name [Bishop] became peculiare to one. He adds, *id tamen ex hominum consuetudine natum est, Scripturæ autoritate minime nititur.* Telling us that under this pretext of giving the name to one, ane unlawful dominion was brought in. But of this againe.

II. The office hereby designed, doth alwayes relate *to the Flock*, and hath them for its *immediat object and Correlat*, as much as the word Pastor. The Bishops of Ephesus were made by the holy Ghost ἐπίσκοπους over the flock of God whom they were to feed. Whereas our supposed Diocesian Episcopus, or Bishop, His office and inspection relates immediatly to the *wholl Pastores* of his dioces, who are alse much, his flock and the object of his oversight, care, direction, correction and censure, as the λαὸς or layetie. Peter, bids the *Episcopountes* feed the flock & act the Bishops over them; But our diocesian Prelat, pretends to feed and rule the Pastores themselves. The Scripture Bishop is *Populi Pastor* but the Diocesian Prelat is *Pastor Pastorum, Presbiter Presbiterorum*, And therfor is ane Antiscriptural Monster.

III. The Diocesian Prelat usurpes and takes from Presbiters that authoritie allowed them of God in his Word. For both power of ordination and jurisdiction is soly and properlie in the Diocesian Prelat according to Episcopal men, and likewise according to our Lawes, As we saw above in the act anent Prelacy. For according thereto the Prelat is a Superior ordinar Church officer above Presbyters, he is sole as to ordination, may

doe it alone, and aſſumes Presbiters onelie *pro forma*. Which no more leſſens his Principalitie and Superemi-nencie in this pointe, then a Prince in aſſumeing Coun-ſellors (ſaith *Downam*, Def. lib 5, Cap. 7.) weakens his princely power and authoritie. Presbyters exerciſe all their Acts of the power of order in a dependance upon him, he only is the proper Paſtor of the dioceſs (as ſhall be afterward cleared) Presbiters are but his ſubſtitutes and helpers. They are likwayes Subject to him as their *proper Sole judge and cenſurer* by Eccleſiaſtick cenſures of ſuſpenſion, depoſition, excommunicati-on, the deciſive power in Church judicatories is pro-perlie his. For the moſt unanimous Acts and concluſi-ons of the dioceſian Synod falls unders his cogniſance, to be ratified or Caſſat at his pleaſure. He is the *Sine quo non*, and hath a *Negative voice* in the judicatories: the law allowing his Presbiters only to give him *advice*, Nay and not that either, unles he judge them of *known layaltie and prudence*. Now, in all theſe, he uſurps over Presbiters authoritie allowed them of God. For I. Wee find the Scripture atributes the power of *order* & *juriſdiction*, equalie to all Presbiters, who have *both keys* of doctrine & diſcipline given them immediatlie by Chriſt. In that I. They are command ἐπισκοπεῖν and ποιμαίνειν 1 Pet. 5. 28. Act. 20: 2. which comprehends the authoritie and exerciſe of both the keys of doctrine and diſcipline. 2. In all commands relating to the exer-ciſe of this power, ther is not the leaſt hint of ane e-qualitie among them, which were very croſs to the Lords Scope, if the Dioceſian Prelats Superioritie were allowed and appointed. The Presbiters or Biſhops of Epheſus, and thoſe of the Churches which Peter writs unto, are commanded to feed and rule jointlie, e-quallie, and with the ſame authoritie, but non of them in dependance upon, and deryving a precarious autho-ritie from another, in feeding and ruleing. 3. In all

the

the commands relating to peoples *Subjection & obedience* to Church Rulers in the exerciſe of their power, their is not the leaſt hint of diſparitie among theſe Rulers. 1 Theſſ. 5:12. People are commanded to obey them that labour among them, and are over them in the Lord, and to eſteem them highly. And Hebr. 13: 17. They are commanded to obey them who have the rule over them and watch for their Soules: but nothing of a ſpecial degrie of obedience to this ſuppoſed higheſt & ſupereminent watch man is heard of in theſe or any ſuch like precepts. And no wonder, for thes ſimple Goſpel times knew no Biſhops who watched not over Soules, and laboured in the word and doctrine. When the Apoſtle Peter commands Chriſtians to obey civil Rulers He diſtinguiſhs the King as Supream, and Governours ſent by him, that a Chief ſubjection may be yeelded to the one, and a ſubordinat to the other. But nothing of this is heard of, in enjoining peoples ſubjection to Miniſters. A ne honour muſt be allowed by Timothey (by the people of God conſequentlie) to elders that rule weil, yea and a double honor, but μαλιϛα, *eſpecialy*, to thoſe that labour in the Word and Doctrine. The Apoſtle in ſtating a diſtinction in the degries of honour allowed to elders, and in this different character of the one from the other, diverſifies elders higher & lower. Now by the ſame reaſon, upon which Divines doe rationaly build this concluſion, it muſt be granted, that the enjoyning obedience to all Paſtores promiſcuusly and without any Note of diſtinction, will inferr their equal office and authoritie. And by the ſame reaſon that the Apoſtle added this μαλιϛα or *eſpecialy*, in this place, he ſhould have added, in theſe, or ſome ſuch comands relating to the peoples obedience, a μαλιϛα or eſpecialy, to diſtinguiſh the Dioceſian Prelat from other Paſtores, and expreſſed it thus, eſteem them all highly obey them, be ſubject to them

that teach and watch over you, All your Pastors, but especially the Supereminent Pastor or Bishop who hath the cheif inspection, and from whom all the rest derive their authoritie. Likwayes in enjoining the pastoral duties, he should have been especially noticed, who had the cheif hand and authoritie therin (which is a Topick improven by this informer) but nothing of this is seen in Scripture, as shall be after, more fully cleared. 4. Wee find accordinglie, *A practical Equalitie*, among Pastores or Bishops in the exercise of this governing power, abundantlie held out and exemplified in Scripture. The judging and censuring of the incestuous man, is by the Apostle enjoyned to the Church Officers or Ministers of Corinth joyntlie. 1 Cor. 5. Chap. compared with 2 Cor. 2. Chap. The Apostle all along supposeth ane inherent authority in these Ministers to put forth this grand *juridical Forensieal Act*; chydes them for so long neglecting it, and shewes its object (viz.) This person under the *formalis ratio* of *wicked or scandalus*. Again he shews its nature to be *A judging*, or *puting* from *among them*, and *delivering to Satan*, upon this judging previous thereunto: He also shews, that this authoritie touches, *all Church Members*, not them that are without, whom God judgeth, but those *that are within*. Now, as hee supposes (I say) ane authority of this Nature and extent inherent in these Church officers, so he speaks to them *indefinitly* and *universally* all along, which were very cross to his Scope, If he had set up or allowed, the Diocesian Prelat whose sole prerogative this were: And the inflicted Censur he calls, with the samine indefinitnes, *A punishment inflicted by many*, who accordingly are commanded with the same indefinitnes or universality of expression, To receave & absolve him upon his repentance. The exercise of the *binding and lowsing power*, being in the representative juridicall

ἐκκλη-

εκκλησια or Church, to whom ſcandales muſt be delated, and to whom the promiſe of ratification of her juricall Acts in Heaven, is made. *Matth.* 18: 17. Beſids we find the exerciſe *of ordination in a Presbitry*, 1 *Tim.* 4: 14. And that even in relation to ane Evangeliſt Timothy. The Presbitry here, muſt be a juridicall Senat and meeting, for the Office can lay on no hands: And ordination is ane hie *authoritative juridicall Act.* Pauls preſence and laying on of hands together with them, confirmes their authoritie, as being *cumulative thereto*, not *privative therof*, even as his countenanceing of, or concurring, with, our Adverſaries pretended Dioceſian Prelat (let us ſuppoſe it in his Act of ordination) would not infringe his pretended right herein. *Ergo.* By their own Confeſſion, and by paritie of reaſon, it cannot infringe or Impeach this power which is attributed to the Presbitery. Had the Apoſtle in ſtead of *Presbyterie*, put in *Prelat* and expreſſed it, thus, By the laying on of the *hands of A Bishop*, or Dioceſian-Biſhop: I ſuppoſe our Adverſaries would have thought the Epiſcopal power of ordination invincibly demonſtrat ther from, notwithſtanding of Pauls ſaying, 2 *Tim* 1: 6. By the laying on *of my hands*, (*viz*) together with the Biſhop. Pauls extraordinare Apoſtolicall impoſition of hands, being no white derogatorie unto the ſuppoſed Epiſcopal ordinarie power, now, verte tabulas, the Apoſtle ſayes, by the laying on of *the handes of the Presbitry*, *Ergo*, the ordinary and equal power of Paſtores, and its equal exerciſe in ordination, is herin convincingly made out.

*Nixt*, The Prelats monopolizing thus in himſelf, the *deciſive ſuffrage* of Judicatories, is croſs many wayes to Scripture. For, 1 Its a ſtepping up (in a peice of Diotrepheſe-lik, or rather papal-pride) above the Apoſtles themſelves, who in Churches conſtitut, did alwayes take alongſt with them, the advice, conſent

and authoritative concurrence of ordinary Ministers and Elders in Government: As is evinced in the premised Scriptures], wherin it is convinceingly clear, that Paul, though ane Apostle of all the Churches, indewed with extraordinarie unconfined inspection over the same, and Pastor thereof, *in actu exercito*, having extraordinary Miracolous-gifts, & being the Master Builder and Spiritual Father, who by the Gospel had begotten both Pastores and flocks of many Churches, Yet would neither excommunicat the incestuous Corinthian alone, but put it upon the Church Officers as their duty to doe it by a judicial, decisive, joynt suffrage: Nor yet did he exclud the presbyters in ordaining even ane Evangilist, but took in their judicial and presbyterial concurrence. And in *Act.* 15. In that meeting or Counsel at Jerusalem, wherewas a wholl Colledge or Presbitery of Apostles, and mett about ane *Act* or decision of a high Nature, wherin was put forth both *Adegmatick*, *critick* & *diatactick* authority or power, in relation to the clearing of that great pointe of truth, anent the abrogation of the Mosaicall ceremonies, and censuring the opposers of Paul and Barnabas herin, who had disturbed the Churches and belied the Apostles Doctrine: And accordingly in order to the restoring and establishing truth and order in these disturbed Churches: The ordinary Ministers or elders concurr with the Apostles in every step: viz, In the conferrence & disquisition, the authoritative decision, the drawing forth of the sentence and decree, the sending out of the decreeing and censuring Epistle, the imposeing of the decrie upon the Churches to observe and keep the same &c. 2. This cutts the throate of that juridical forensical joynt decision of Church Judicatories, which the Scriptur doth so clearly hold forth. Where is the ἐκκλησια the censureing juridiall court, drawing forth a joynt decision or censure? Wher is the Presbi-

Presbiteries forenſicall Act in ordination of Timothie? To what end muſt the Corinth Church Officers *Meet together*, and authoritatively and joyntlie puniſh or cenſur the inceſtuous man? Wher is that *pleaſing of the Apoſtles and elders as* the foundation of the Synodical decree and letter, together with, *it ſeemed good to the Holy Ghoſt, and to us*, And to us, *Mett with one accord.* Wher is, I ſay, this joynt deciſive power of Church Judicatories, thus clearly held out in the premiſed Scriptures, if the Act and Eccleſiaſtick deciſion thereof, be ſoly the Prelats, *ſic volo, ſic jubeo*, masked with advice of Presbyters, of whoſe advice he may make what uſe he pleaſes, and with a ſimple *nego*. make their judgment and ſuffrage evaniſh into ſmoake. 3. This power of the Prelats cuts of from Miniſters one half of their authoritie and commiſſion receaved in their ordination. They are made therein (as is clear in Scripture, & our adverſaries grant it) Rulers, Governours, Overſeers, Paſtors & Stewards in the Church; Have both the Shepherds bagg & ſtaff, the key of doctrine and the key of diſcipline intruſted to them. By what warrand then muſt they give up all their power in government & their deciſive ſuffrage in Church Judicatories, unto the domineering Prelat, and as to ſpiritual power in Church Judicatories, become meer Ciphers? They watch and rule as they that muſt give account of all their adminiſtration to Chriſt. Peter exhorts the Elders ſuteablie to exetciſe their Epiſcopal Authority over the flock, that they may get the Crown from the chief Shepherd. Stewards (of God eſpecially) muſt be faithful, and imploy well all their Talents receaved from the great Maſter, that they may get his approbation and reward as faithful Servants. The Elders of Epheſus were obteſted by Paul to take heed to themſelves, and to all the flock over which they were made Biſhops by the Holy Ghoſt, to feed and rule the Church which God hath

pur-

purchaſed with his blood. Now all thes exhortations directed to Miniſters, are to no purpoſe, if they have no inherent *immediat Rule*, *eſſentially included in their office*, And to be exerciſed accordingly, but muſt only preach as *a Dioceſian Prelats Deputes*, and be in the exerciſe of their ruling governing power, abſolutly ſubject to him and at his diſpoſal. *Finally*, This uſurped authoritie in the *Prelat* ſets him above the reach of *all cenſure by Church Judicatories*; So that though Miniſters are abſolutly and at his beck, cenſurable by, and ſubject to him, both as to their doctrine, converſation and diſcipline (and every one of them thus cenſurable and jointly) yet *this hie Pop*, who judges *All*, will be judged *by none* himſelf, Either as to his Doctrine, Life or Government. Some have ſaid of the Prince, that though *major ſingulis*, yet he is *minor univerſis*, leſs then the whole body of the people, though greater then every one aparte. But the Prelat exerciſes a greater ptincipalitie in Church Judicatories, & is therein *major univerſis*, greater then the whole meeting, ſo that thogh he can ſtop the Votes and Cenſures of the whole Synod, yet they cannot either by ſuffrage or cenſure in the leaſt put a check to him, in any of His moſt v icked Acts or Antichriſtian Exorbitances. Now, how contrary this is to Scriptur, any may judge. The Prophets after their propheſying muſt be *judged by the reſt*, as to their doctrine, 1 Cor. 14: 29, Ergo, *a fortiori*, much more as to their converſation & government, are lyable to be judged, and conſequentlie cenſured if deſerving it: For he were a great Critick, that would diſtinguiſh theſe, ſo as thoſe who have power to judge, have no power to cenſure or paſs ſentence upon their judging: And this is founded upon a general comprehenſive ground, viz. *the Spirits of the Prophets* (that is the gifts and exerciſes of the Miniſtery in all Church Officers without exception) *are ſubject to the Prophets*, viz. to their diſquiſition, and cenſure in any peece of their work

work or official Acts. Now unles our Prelats would deny themſelves to be Prophets and Miniſters, or the Presbyters to be Prophets, they muſt acknowledge this ſubjection to their cenſure enjoyned in the Scripture premiſed, and conſequently, that their exeeming themſelves from the ſame, is an anti-ſcriptural uſurpation. I remember, while a writting, that propoſing once this Argument to ane Epiſcopal Clergie man, I enquired to what Church Judicatorie in Scotland was *Mr Sharp* ſubject, as to either his life or doctrine? He anſwered that he was *ſubject to a general Counſell*, and this was very appoſit and conſequenter to their principles: So that our *Prelats* (at leaſt the two Arch-) are in no fear, but of a general Council if the Court froune not. In our Act of Parliament touching the mould of our National Synod, the *Primat* is the *eſſential Preſident*, *& ſine quo non*, and ſo is ſure enough, from being cenſured there; ſo are the reſt of the Prelats as to all their Synods, according to our Lawes. But what think theſe *exleges Epiſcopi*, or *hie Court Prelats*, of ſuch a humble Biſhop as the Apoſtle Paul, who had hands laid upon him, and was authoritativelie ſent out by that Presbitery of Prophets and teachers at *Antioch* Act. 13. together with Barnabas, (about ane eminent Goſpel-Legation) and was by the ſame Church and Presbytery ſent (together with Barnabas and certain other commiſſioners of the Churches) to that Synod at Jeruſalem, Act. 15. Why did not Paul make uſe of his Negative voice and command them all ſilence in this debate? How comes it, that his hie Biſhop ſubjects himſelf to the authoritative bleſſing and miſſion of ſome pettie Prophets and teachers. Ane amazeing looking glaſs, this is, (no doubt) to our *aſpyreing Prelats*.

4. The holding of the Dioceſian Prelat, and obtruding him upon the Church, as ane ordinary Church officer, diſtinct from, and ſuperior to Presbiters, doth many

wayes *Impeach Christs Kingly office as head and lawgiver of his Church*: whose faithfulnes above that of Moses (who ordered, according to the Patern shewed upon the Mount, the least pine of the Tabernacle) must needs reach the appointment of the officers, offices, qualifications, work and gifts of these officers, who are to officiat in his house, as our Confession of Faith and Catechisim doe assert. For according to our Prelatical Clergie, and according to the Lawes, the Prelat hath a *distinct Work* from that of a Presbiter (viz.) to govern a dioceſs, he hath the *Actus primus* of a State ruler, to sitt in Council or Parliament. Nixt, he hath a distinct solemne *Consecration* or inauguration to his Office. And 3. Must needs be supposed to have likwise *distinct qualifications and Gifts* from those of a preaching Presbiter, conferred by this solemne imposition of hands and blessing at his Consecration, wherby he must be supposed to have a *superior distinct mission*, and to be in all the forementioned particulars, distinct from, and superior to a Presbiter. Now, if non of all these points of his superioritie can be found in Scripture, this Officer patched up thereof, must either be unwarrantable, or, Christ the Churches head and lawgiver, his Lawes and rules in point of Church Government, and in relation to the duties, gifts, ordination, and work of Church Officers, are not *full and perfect*, but mank and deficient as to such an eminent Church Officer. And where is then the *perfection of his word and Testament*, to make not only the ordinarie Christian but even *the man of God*, the Minister of God, perfect and throughly furnished to every good work. That non of all the formentioned particulars as to this Officer distinct from and superior to a Presbiter, can be found in Scripture, but are contrarie therunto. I prove thus 1. The Scriptur mentions no name, qualification, work, dutie or ordination of any or dinary Church

Church Officer superior to presbiters, and which are not likewayes appropriat to them, who are called Rulers, Governours, Bishops; and both ordination and Jurisdiction ar apropriat to them in a perfect paritie 1 Thess. 5: 12. with 17. v. and 1 Tim. 5: 17. Hebr. 13. v. 7, 17. 1 Cor. 5: 13. 1 Tim. 4: 14. 3 Epist. Ioh. 9. v. —— 2. In all the Holy Ghost his purposed recitalls of ordinarie Church officers, and purposed declaration of their gifts and duties, ther is not the least hint of the premised ingredients of the office of this supposed Diocesian Bishop, as thus distinct from and Superior to Presbiters, (1 Cor. 12: 28. Eph. 4: 11, 12. Rom. 12. 7, 8. In these places wee have besyds the Apostles, Prophets & Evangelists (whose Office, as extraordinaire, is ceased) Pastores, Elders, Deacons; But no hint of the Office, name, qualifications or Mission, of ane ordinarie Church Officer Superior to the Pastor, is either heire or in any Scripture else, which notwithstanding is express as to the Office and qualifications even of the Deacon, the lowest Officer. Strange! the server of Tables his Office and ordination clearlie set down in Scriptur: And yet *Altum silentium*, as to either, name, Office or ordination, of the Diocesian Bishop. If the argument of our divines be good from hence against the Pope, because not mentioned in these Catalogues of Church Officers, *Ergo, a pari*, It must hold good against the Prelat. And as to that, that the Prelat hath the *Actus Signatus* of a State Ruler, how cross this is to Scripture, we may after shew. Sure, since Christ set all these his Officers *in the Church*, and commands them diligentlie to *wait upon*, and attend their work and Ministery therein; He never made or allowed them to bee *State Rulers*

---

## Chap. II:

*Some more Arguments againſt the Dioceſian Prelat. That his office debaſes the Acts and exerciſe, of the power of order, cleared. It maims and diverſifies the Paſtoral office, by anti-ſcriptural new invented degrees thereof. His offiee, many wayes contrare to the very nature of the Goſpel-Church-Government.*

THe *Dioceſian Biſhop*, his office is in this contrare to the Word of God.

V. In that it *Debaſes the higheſt Acts and exerciſe of the power of order*, in a *Goſpel Miniſtery*. For all do grant preaching of the Word and the Adminiſtration of the Sacraments and Seals of the Covenant of grace to be ſuch: So that he who can do thes Acts, hath the badge of the higheſt Miniſterial Authority as ane ordinarie Church Officer, theſe being among the moſt emnient Acts of the Apoſtles there office and Authoritie —— *Go teach, baptize, &c.* They muſt have ſome to ſerve Tables that they may give themſelves continually to the *Miniſtery of the Word*. Timothy, our prelatical mens Suppoſed-Biſhop, muſt *preach the Word*, and be inſtant in ſeaſon, out of ſeaſon, reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long ſuffering and Doctrine 2 Tim. 4: 1, 2. The great Apoſtle of the Gentiles who had the care of all the Churches coming upon him, and therin a great ruleing work, Yet pronunces a woe upon himſelf, if he preach not the Goſpel 1 Cor. 9: 28. —— And he tells us this was a ſpeciall truſt committed to him: In this he admires the rich grace of God that he was putt into the Miniſtery, and honoured to preach the unſearchable riches of Chriſt. Peter, that great Apoſtle of the circumciſion

ciſion; when by the Lord reſtored to his office, and encouraged to its exerciſe, by a Threefold renovation of his Miſſion; is thryce enjoyned (as the great badge of his love to his Maſter) to feed his Lambes and Sheep. Accordingly, the Scripture Biſhop muſt be διδακτικος Apt to teach; and he that teacheth (by office ſcilicet) muſt *waite upon teaching*, and the wiſe and faithful Steward appointed by the Lord to give the children their meat in dew Seaſon, muſt be found *So doeing* when the Lord comes to reckon with him; and not lay up this noble Talent in a Napkine. To this, the key of diſciplin is inferior and Subordinat, as themean to its end, the higher honour above *ruleing* only being allowed to the labourer in the word & doctrine, 1 Tim. 5: 17. This being clear, I ſay the office of the Dioceſian Biſhop debaſes and tramples upon, theſe highe and noble Acts of a Paſtor, and conſequently upon the premiſed Scriptures aſſerting the ſame, and that in theſe wayes. 1. In that the quondam Presbyter only, when made a Prelat, leaves off, The feeding of the flock, and layes by the preaching talent, the Church wher he did preach or officiat, it may be, ſhall never ſee or hear him againe, but is *ipſo facto*, voyde to be poſſed by another, nor by his now-office is he obliged to preach or Miniſter the Sacraments any more at all, theſe petty peeces of work being below his new Lordſhip. Trew, he may preach if he pleaſe, and at the Church wher he reſeeds, but that is *per accidens* ex abundanti, and out of courteſie: but by his office, *Qua Prelat*, he *is* bound to preach no more to any flock, nor is he in the leaſt judged faultie or deficient in his Epiſcopal office if he be wholly ſilent. Nay, in England preaching Prelats have been highely upbraided and reproached by their fellowes, and called *preaching Cox Combes*. Wee all know, what ane odd peece of work *Mr Lightoun's* preaching was eſteemed by the ge-

neralitie of the Prelatick partie when he turned Prelat. Now, let any of commune Reason or ingenuity judge, what ane office that must be, which putts a Minister intrusted with the Lords great commission to preach the Gospel, under pretence of advancement to a higher Sphere in the Ministery, to lay by this work which is the noblest and highest of the Ministerial Authoritie, wherin the Apostles themselves mainely laboured and gloried, as the most noble meane of the conversion of Soules: and consequentlie of the glorie of Christ therin; Nay, to lay by this noble work under pretence of new burdene of Government. Wheras the Apostles who had the wholl Churches to plant and Govern, most enixely plyed this work still. If this man become not a dumb dog and a sloathfull unprofiteable servant, let any judge. 2. The Diocesian Prelat debases and tramples upon this noble work, in that he makes it in all the Pastores of the Dioces, to depend upon his Lordly disposal, and the authoritie thereof to be deryved from him as the sole proper Pastor of all the Dioces, whose deputs the preachers are in this work, although himself is obleiged to feed no flock. 3 He maks these high and noble Acts *of the power of order*, [*preaching* and *administration of Sacraments*] a lower and subordinat work and office, to the work and office of *ruleing only*, which is his *Characteristick* whereby he holds himself Superior to all the preachers of the Dioces? whereas the Scriptur doeth (as we heard) appropriat the highest honour to the *labourer* in *the word and doctrine* as the nobler employment and office, above the Ruler only.

6. In this the Diocesian Prelats office is contrare unto, and reprobat by the Scriptur, in that by *Apocriphal*, *Antiscriptural*, new invented, *Degrees and orders*. It diversifies and cutts asunder what God hes made one and the same, I mean the *Pastoral Office*, and by consequence

quence other offices mentioned in Scripture, as that of Prophets, Evangeliſts, Deacons; non of which offices admites of *Subordinat Spheeres and degrees*, but all the perſons that are Intruſted with theſe offices, are of the ſame degree and authority therin by the Word of God. No Evangeliſt, Prophet, or Apoſtle is found of a Superior office or order to other Apoſtles, Evangeliſts, &c. Whence comes this diverſity then in the Paſtoral office, that one Paſtor muſt have a Lordly Dominion over ſome hundreds of his fellowes? If it be ſaid, that the Epiſcopal office ſucceeds that of the Apoſtles or Evangeliſts? beſides that wee ſhall diſprove this afterward, and ſhew that theſe offices taken *formaliter* as ſuperior to that of the Paſtor, are expyred, as ſound Divines doe almoſt univerſally grant; I anſwer that moſt, if not all Prelatiſts ancient and modern, doe hold the Dioceſian Prelat to be no officer *Specifically diſtinct* from the Presbyter or Paſtor, but only *gradually diſtinct*, as being a Paſtor with a more amply extended authority for order of Government. *Mr Burnet*, in his pretended vindication of the preſent Prelacie, 4t. Conference, pag. 310, 311. tells us, that he is not clear anent the notion (as he calls it) of the diſtinct offices of Biſhop and Presbyter and akonowledges the Presbyter to be of the *hieſt office* in the Church, telling us that the Prelat is but a different degree in the ſame office. Although in this he and the reſt doe ſpeak moſt inconſequently, the forementioned ingredients of the Prelatical function, being ſuch, as doe certanly amount to make up a *new ſpecies* of ane office, ſuch as a different work, conſecration or ordination, the *actus primus* of a State Ruler, different qualifications (by conſequence) above and beyond theſe of a Presbyter. The diverſitie of theſe diſtinguiſhes the Scripture offices of Apoſtles, Evangeliſts, &c. which Paul ſetts in ſeveral Claſſes, as, firſt, and ſecond. 1 Cor. 12: 28. Mr Burnet his reaſon is the ſame with that

of others herine (viz) the Paſtors authority to adminiſter the word & Sacraments which are the higheſt acts of the power of order. He tells us [that ſince the Sacramental actions are the higheſt of ſacred performances: he cannot but acknowlege that ſuch as are impowered for them, muſt be of the *hieſt effice*, in the Church] now I ſay, ſince they will needs have the Dioceſian Biſhop to be only a different degree of the Presbyterat or Paſtoral office, they cannot with any ſhaddow of reaſon make him Succeſſor to the Evangeliſts or Apoſtles in their formal office, which they will not dare to affirm to be only a different degree of the Presbyterat or Paſtores office, and will affirme it to have been ſpecifically diſtinct from the ſame. The Ancients and Schoolemen held that the Paſtor in his ordination receaved the ſame *Power of Government* that the Prelat hath, but that *the Prelat is the* [*primus Presbyter,*] who hath the raines of *all the exerciſe*, in his hand. But how croſs is this to Scripture, that any Church officer hath a power and authoriritie which he cannot exerciſe? To whomſoever God hath given the *power*, he hath certainlie *commanded the exerciſe of it*; and particularly Paſtores or Presbyters are (as we have heard) enixely commanded to exerciſe all their Paſtoral authority and power, as they ſhall anſwer to their great Maſter. Beſyds, if the Paſtoral office, or its official power of order and jurisdiction, may be warrantably thus divided and cutt out in 8 breeds and parcells, and divyded among different recipients, then it were lawful to divyde preaching and adminiſtration of the Sacraments, ſo as one Presbyrer (notwithſtanding of his authority and miſſion, in relation to both word and Sacraments, receaved in his ordination) might have *preaching only* allowed to him, but no adminiſtration of Sacraments: Another might be allowed to adminiſter Sacraments, *but not to preach.* One Presbyter upon the pretence of order or union

(pre-

(pretences are never wanting to humane inventions) might be sett a part and authorised to Baptise all the Children in a wholl Province, doing nothing elsse of the Pastoral Office, And this power by the same authority might be taken from all the Pastoures of the Province, Sure all would acknowledge this to be a most wicked divyding and diversifieing what God the conjoyned. And such is this Prelatical divyding of the Pastoral charge in relation to order and jurisdiction, or the keys of Doctrine & Government? the power wherof, the Pastor receaves intirely in his ordination, as well as the Authority of administrating Sacraments.

7. In this the Diocesian Bishop is contrare to Scripture. In that his Office is in many respects cross to the very nature of the Gospel-Church Government, and is ane Office which the man that exercises, cannot but in so farr cease to be a Gospel Church-ruler, Which I prove thus. 1. Since all authority in the Dioces, as to either the Word or Disciplin, is deryved from the Bishop, as its proper fountaine and subject, this power of the Bishop is properlie and of its own nature, not a Gospel Ministery, But *a dominion and principalitie*, discharged to Church Officers of what ever sorte, whose authority is not *a despotick*, *nomothetick*, or *architectonick power*, but a Ministerial Stewardship only. Matth. 20: v. 25, 26. 2 Cor. 1: 24. 1 Cor. 4: 1. 1 Pet. 5: 2, 3. 3 Epist. John. 9. The work of all Church Officers, is called *a Ministery*, Pastours, Doctores, yea Apostles, Evangelists were appointed εἰς ἔργον διακονίας for the worke of the Ministery, Ephes. 4: 12. 2 Cor. 4: v. 5. Paul calls himself a fellow servant with Epaphras, Collos. 17. with Tichicus Collos. 4: 7. And calls Ministers his fellow-souldiers and fellow-labores Philip. 4. 3. - 2. 25. - Rom. 16: 3. - 2. The Bishops power inverts Christs rule, as to the *gradation in point of censures and appealls*, which is from one one to more, from the lesser

number to the greater, from the Presbytery to the Synod, as from the Presbytery at Antioch, to the Synod at Jerusalem: Not to any one Apostle, Pop, or Prelat; Whereas the last appeal and reference in this Diocesian Mould, is *to the Bishop*. Our Lords rule is this in relation to the removing of Scandales. First, tell the offending Brother Alone, then take two or three more, then if he be farder contumacious, *tell the Church*, the greater embodied court or Judicatorie, who have the official power of binding or lowseing. He bidds not toll it, *uni*, to one, but *unitati*, a multitud gathered into one, for so the Greek word doth necessarly Import, whereas in the Diocesian sea, the gradation is from many to one Prelat, whose sole prerogative this highest censure, is. And with Prelatists the rule runns thus, tell two, or three, lastlie and finallie one Lord-Bishop: Which is point blank contrare to the Scripture rule. 3. The Diocesion Bishops power, and Ministerial Pastoral pretended duties, *as Diocesian Bishop* are such as *falls within he compass of no command*, and which it is impossible to performe according to Scripture rules, which I prove thus. 1. The Prelat according to their principles is the *proper Pastor of the whole Dioces*, for he being peculiarly *Bishop of it*, and consecrat in order to his Episcopal inspection over the same (for to the participation of his power & office, denoted by this term [Bishop of Edinburgh] &c. He admitts non in the dioces, it being the characteristick of his Superioritie over Presbyters) & withall, it including the wholl Ecclesiastick Authority both of order and Jurisdiction with in the Dioces; It followes of necessity that he is the sole and proper Pastor thereof according to this mould of Government. Now it being so, let it be considered 1. That the trew Scripture etimon of *Episcopus* or *Bishop*, imports all the Pastorall duties of feeding and ruling, and layes ane obligation upon the

the perſon under this relation and cloathed with this Office, to perform all theſe duties accordingly to theſe to whom he ſtands in that relation. 2. That its impoſſible the Biſhop can feed, Rule, Overſee, and perform the Paſtoral duties unto, and watch for the ſouls of all that large flock, in which, ſome hundereds of painful Paſtores will find their hands full of work. So that the Biſhop aſſumes a charge, which it is impoſſible he can diſchag or perform. 3. The Scripture allowes no *Derivation* or *Deputation* of the Paſtores work and Office to which he is called of God, unto other ſubſerviant Officers. Becauſe God intruſts no man with any peece of Stewardſhip in his Family, but what he muſt both overſie and execut immediatly by himſelf, and is likewayes diſpoſed and enabled to manage and overtake. God ſtill conjoyneing the Office, gifts, and call together, for every peece of his work: Which the man that is intruſted with, and called unto, muſt himſelf immediatly waite upon and attend Rom. 12. 7. and not intruſt it to others for him. *Hence* 4. By clear conſequence, it followes, that the Dioceſian Biſhopes work *qua talis*, is ſuch, as he can neither mannage nor hath warrand from the great Shepherd to exerciſe or aſſume. In the 4t. Place, the preſent Dioceſian Biſhop is a Perſon who is authoriſed to ſitt in Parliament, Council, and other civil Judicatories, as a *conſtituent member* therof: For they are reſtored to *their places in Parliament & civil pretended dignities*, which places they ar by there Office bound to manage, as civil Rulers. But ſo it is that all *civill dominion*, & Magiſtraticall Rule, is expreſly prohibit to *Church Rulers*, ſo that the Church Officer who is inſtalled in theſe Offices, falls from Heaven to Earth. The Princes of the Gentiles exerciſe Dominion over them, and they that are great exerciſe authotie upon them, but it ſhall not be ſo among you. Matth. 20: 25, 26. This charge our Lord gave to his

Apostles and their Successors Pastores or Bishops, who are here forbidden all civill rule or Magistracy, the nature wherof is properly a *Dominion*, and thus distinct *toto cœlo* from the nature of Ecclesiastick Offices which is a Ministerial service or stewardship only. All our divines impugne from this text the popes civil Dominion and the *amphibius* civily ruleing or domineering Prelat falls under the lash thereof. Non who goe Christs errands and his warrfare must be intangled with these things that are temporal The Minister must *waite upon his Ministrie*. So the civil Magistrat is Gods Minister in civiles, *attending Continually* upon this employment Rom. 13: 4, 6. Now, those being in their nature so disparat employments, and both requireing a constant waiting and attendance, he is a strange man, That can be called and sufficient for both: Who *is* sufficient for these things said the great and highly gifted Paul, speaking of his Ministerial employments: Are our Prelats beyond his sufficiencie, who can act the Pastor of a wholl Dioceſs and guide State affaires too? Christs Kingdome is not *of this World*, and so are not *its Officers*, the weapons of whose warrfare must not be carnal. Who made me a judge, said the great Shepherd himself, when desired but to giue a deciding advice in a civil cause Luk. 12: 14. Where is there any thing like the work or qualifications of the Magistrat in all the New Testament Rules and instructions anent the work, Office and call of Church Officers.

---

## Chap. III.

*The Diocesian Bishops Office debases extraoadinarie Offices, in confounding them with the ordinary. That Timothy and Titus power layes no foundation for Prelacy, cleared at large. The derivation of Prelacie from them, loaded with gross absurdites.*

VIII. THe Diocesian Bishops Office, is in this contrare unto the word, in that *It debases the Apostolical and Euangelistick Offices, and confounds the ordinarie & extraordinarie functions & administrations*, which Scripture, Reason, & all sound Divines doe diversifie & distinguish. The Prelats Advocats, *& this new informer particularly*, pleads for and derives the Episcopal preheminence from *the office and inspection of the Apstles and Euangelists*, whom they affirme to have been properly & formally *Bishops*, in the sense they take the Diocesian Bishop, and that the formal power and offices, which they exercised are to be *continued still* in the Church. That *Timothy* was formally constitut *Bishop of Ephesus, Titus of Crete, James of Jerusalem.* And that the Prelats office, *is the same*, and properly Succeeds them, and is as it were, *A continuation* of their office in a formal sense. Timothy's authority is is one maine ground which the Episcopal men at the *Isle of Wight*, and this *Auther* also do plead to legittimat the Prelats office. This being clear, I say, this pretended Mould of the Diocesian Bishops Office and Authority, is lyable to the charge & censure of debasing these holy extraordinarie functions, and confounding them with the ordinary, which I prove, thus. 1. All sound protestant Divines do harmoniously assert the extraordinary nature of the Apostolick

ſtolick office as ſuch, and likewayes of the Euangeliſts, reckening the Apoſtles, Prophets, and Euangeliſts as the extraordinary New Teſtament Officers, whoſe proper formal Office, *died with them, and admits of no ſucceſſion:* for thus they ordinarily defyne *the Apoſtles*, that they were Chriſts *immediatly called and extraornarily gifted univerſal Ambaſſadours, ſent out, to lay every where the foundation of the Goſpel Church, and to plant the Goſpel government therein*: Particularly *Polanus* in his *Syntagma* reckens up theſe as their extraordinary expired prerogatives (to which we will find this Informer in parte give aſſent.) 1. Their immediat inſtitution by Chriſt. 2. Their immediat miſſion to teach, (Paul had his from heaven.) 3. Their univerſal legation to found and plant Churches throw the world. 2 Cor. 11:28. ——— 4. Its viſible badge, (viz.) the conferring of the Spirit by the laying on of hands. 5. Their extraordinary authority beyond any of their Succeſſors, as being ſet over the whole Church &c. Hence all the ingredients of their formal Office, as ſuch, muſt needs be expired, And no Church Officer can be ſaid to ſucceed them therein. Their *Call* was immediat, ſure, non can ſucceed them in that. *Their ſpecial* or *proper work*, was to plant Churches and the Goſpel-government in them, and ſet up their Officers, of all which Churches they were Miniſters *in actu exercito*, ſure no Church Officer could ſucceed them in this. Their *Qualifications* as ſuch Ambaſſadours, were correſpondent to this great work, (viz.) their gifts of miracles, gifts of tongues, Propheſie, infallibility in Doctrin; Sure now can pretend to ſucceed them in this. *Nixt*, for the Euangeliſts, their Office was equally extraordinary, it conſiſting in *a planetary motion*, from place to place, to water where the Apoſtles planted, to bring reports of the Churches ſtate to the Apoſtles, and commiſſions from the Apoſtles to them

them. Their various motions, *pro re nata*, upon & down, even after theſe Epiſtles (wherein they are ſuppoſed to have receaved their Epiſcopal charge) were written to them; and the Scriptures abſolut ſilence as to their ever returning to theſe Churches againe, beſides the Apoſtle Pauls ſhewing expreſly in theſe Epiſtles, *their occaſional tranſient employment* in this places, and expreſs *recalling* of them therefrom, to the further proſecution of their extraordinary employment, and in theſe very Epiſtles identifying the Office of the Biſhop and Elder: All theſe clear grounds I ſay, do evidently demonſtrat that the *work and office of Timothy and Titus* as Euangeliſts, is expired, and cannot be pretended unto by any ordinary Church Officer, it being an appendix as it were of the Apoſtolick charge, and ſuppoſing its exerciſe and exiſtance, and the Churches then-infant ſtate and condition. Now, to make theſe high and extraordinary functions, ordinary, and thus confound the two together, muſt be a very groſs uſurpation. 2. Hence it is manifeſt, that the Epiſcopal function (as above deſcribed in the quality and mould of the Dioceſian Biſhop) will never be found in theſe extraordinary functions, either *formaliter, or eminenter*, and conſequently it muſt be a groſs belying of the Spirit of God, to pretend this in the aſſuming of this uſurped Office. Firſt, The Epiſcopal Office will not be found in that of the Apoſtles or Euangeliſts *formaliter*. For theſe were *univerſal unfixed Officers*, ſet over no particular Church or Dioceſs: But were *pro re nata* to officiat to the whole Church as being (the Apoſtles eſpecially) Officers thereof *in actu exercito*. *Nixt*, the Epiſcopal function is not included in theſe Offices *eminenter*, or in the ordinary power whi the Apoſtles or Euangeliſts exerciſed, or tranſmitte the Church. And that for theſe Reaſons. 1. Neit the Apoſtles nor Euangeliſts in reſpect of their *perpet ordinary Miniſterial authority* tranſmitted by them in t

Churc..

Church, did exercise *Superiority Episcopal* over other Ministers, but as to the perpetual *Pastoral Charge*, they held them their equals, and in the *ordinary power* of government, as wee saw above in the Apostles practise in ordination and Jurisdiction amongst Churches constitut, and farr less can we suppose that the Euangelists were in such Churches to exercise any single or Episcopal preheminence in government. For it were strange if Timothy who was ordained by a Presbytrye wherein Paul himself was present, should notwithstanding usurpe preheminence over a Presbytery though inferior to ane Apostle. And that whereas Presbyters did concurr *pari passu* with a whole Presbytery of Apostles in every peece of a judicial Act and decree, yet that ane Euangelist inferior to any of the Apostles, should take Episcopal preheminence over a Presbytery. 2. The Apostles planted no such *ordinary Officers* in the Church, as had that *Episcopal Power*, therefore the Episcopal Power was not transmitted by them in the Church: And by further consequence it is not included in their Office *eminenter*. For it is evident, that in the first plantation of the Churches they fixed Presbyters, or Pastors, as their immediat Successor's in the Ministerial power, and likewise in their last farewel's into Churches, they committed unto these Pastors the ordinary power of government, without the least hint of *a Super-institution* of any officer of *a higher order*. Act. 20:28, 29. Compared with 25. 1 Per. 5:2, 3. with 2 Pet. 1: 14 —— 3. It was in respect of Paules ordinary Ministerial power, and in that Capacitie, that he had hands laid upon him by that Presbytety at Antioch, and was sent out with other commissioners to that Synod at Jerusalem by them, which looked like a humble submission *pro tanto*, unto them, and is far from the Episcopal preheminence: since the Prelats dissoune all Subjection to the Prophes in greater or lesser assemblies. 4. The Prelats authority is this,

he

he is upon the mater the only proper Paſtor of the Dioceſs, whoſe Epiſcopal inſpection reaches Paſtores and flocks both, as is above cleared. He is the fountaine from whom the power of order and Juriſdiction in the wholl Dioceſs, is deryved, and the exerciſe of both depends upon his Lordly diſpoſal. Now, this is contrare both to the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts their ordinary and extraordinary power, contrare to *its very nature in universum*, their office being a declarative executive *Miniſterie* onlie: And *Dominion or Lordship* being diſcharged to all Apoſtles, and all Church Officers whatſoever.

Hence in the 3d. place, This Epiſcopal pretence, anent the derivation of *their Lordly grandour*, from the Apoſtolick Office, faſtens a groſſe charge of *unfaithfulneſs* upon them. 1. In aſſuming a power *in its nature diſtinct* from what there Lord allowed and enjoyned them (viz.) a Lordly dominion, not a miniſterial Stewardſhipe & ſervice only, & ſuch a dominion as *Princes of the gentiles* exerciſe, even to have the *actus primus* of *a civil Lord-peer*, yea *Chieff-peer*, or Parliament man. 2. In debaſeing and *Straitening* their Apoſtolick Inſpection, and carrying ane Office *incompatible* with it, and thus unfaithfully tearing out a parte of their commiſſion. For, in becoming Dioceſian Biſhops, they ſhould be fixed to particular dioceſſes, and therin exerciſe ane ordinary fixed poever, wheras their commiſſion was to exerciſe ane extraordinary unfixed miniſtery towards all the Churches, planted, and to be planted. 3. In ſetting up up *no ſuch ordinare officers* to ſucceed them in this ſo neceſſarie a work, but committing the wholl governement *to meer presbyters* as is ſaid. 4. In ommiting in all their *rules & preſcriptions* anent Church government, & the offices and officers therof, the leaſt intimation of this officer, and giving no rules for either *the qualifications* or *ordination* of any higher officer then a *meer presbyter*. 5.

In

In expreſſ diſchargeing of *Lordly dominion & prehéminence* among ordinary Church officers Now, if this be not a debaſing of, and hie reflection upon, theſe eminent extraordinary Church officers, both to make them carry ane office contrare and inferior unto, and inconſiſtent with ther holy functions, intruſted to them by the Lord, and likewayes in their practice to contradict their doctrin in relation to Church government, yea and in both their Doctrin and practice, to contradict & croſſe the *Lords great commiſſion and inſtructions*, If this be not, I ſay, a horrid reflection upon their faithfullnes, Let any judge.

---

## Chap. IV:

*The diſceſian Prelats office, taks away the peoples right, to Call there Paſtor. This right proved from Scriptur and divine Reaſon. It excludes the office of the Ruleing elder. Some Cheiff exceptions of the prelatick party to that* 1. *Tim.* 5. 17. *Anſuered.*

IN the 9t. place. The Epiſcopal government is in this contrare unto the word; In that it curts off Congregations from all intereſt and right, in *Calling there Paſtor.* For in this government, the Miniſters miſſion, Call, Ordination, and Relation to ſuch a people, over whom he is to officiat, flowes all from the Prelat. The Congregationall elderſhip have not the Leaſt intereſtin it. Hence this power of calling Paſtores was ranverſed by our Parliament when prelacie was ſet up, and the old popiſh Cuſtome of patronages was reſtored. The Prelat ſends a man to the poor people as their Miniſter, whom

whom possibly they never sawe in the face. Now, this is contrare both to Scriptur and reason, contrare, to the practice of the apostolick Church. For 1. Even the deacons *were looked out, and chosen by the people.* Act. 6. 3. That the Apostles might ordaine and lay their hands upon them, and install them in their office with a publick blessing: And if the people were to have so great ane Interest in chooseing these men (though even the Apostles, who had infallible knouledge of qualifications, were present to ordaine them) that this trust of disbursseing their Almes or charitie, might be committed to non but upon *their consent & choyce.* Ergo, a fortiori, People have a far greater Interest as to their Consent and choyce of the man, To whom they are to Intrust their Soules conduct unto another world, which is of infinit more worth then all the Earthes treasures, And while the are no such infalible discerners of fitt persons to officiat, as the Apostles were, If the Apostles would not set apart men fot this meaneſt employment, without the Peoples Consent *& looking them out*, How absurd is it, that the higheſt ordinary officer [the Pastor] should be sent to officiat in that eminent office with out ther knowledge or Consent.

2 Wee find the chooseing and sending out of Church officers *in this hie ministeriall employment*, To have been upon the peoples consent and choyce: for Act. 14. The Elders or Ministers who were ordained κατὰ ἐκκλησίαν or Church by Church, were thus ordained and sett apart to their office, Compared with Tit. 1. 5. Berause (not to stand here upon the import of the greek word χειροτονία, which imports a hand suffrage, and consent of the people, as shale be made good upon the *Third Dialogue* and the exceptions of *this pamphleter*, upon that passage, examined) this is clear, that this ordination was to be performed *in the Church*, Ergo, of neeessity, with the peoples Consent and choice: And

Nixt

Nixt, If the Apostles would not ordaine the *Deacons*, but after this manner, much lesse Ministers unto such a weighty employment, since in ther faithfullnes the people are (as is said) infinitly more concerned. Besydes, the very Intimation, and litte, of the men out of whom a Successor to the Apostleshipe in the place of Judas, was by God immediatly to be chosen, was with the peoples Consent, Therfor much more ought this to be in the ordination and admission of ane ordinary officer whose call is mediat and ordinarie. 3. The Scripture doeth clearly hold forth *a congregational Church & juridical eldership, representing that Church.* Which (besyes many other reasons addducible, and accordingly pleaded by our writters) is evident in this, That as the Scripture makes mention of greater Churches, such as that of Corinth, Jerusalem &c, Who were certanly presbyterial, because, they are found, thogh consisting of many officers and Rulers, and of lesser Societies, yet to be all poynted out as *one Church*, which must needs Import *a Classicall or presbiterial unitie* of these lesse Societies. So the Spirit of God doth also call these lesser Societies *Churches*, in the plural. Let the Woman keep Silence ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις *in the Churches* 1. Cor. 14. 34. Which must needs Import the *Single Congregations* of that one Church of Corinth. And moreover, through thes Churches *Rulers, Elders, & Gouvernours* were sett and established κατὰ ἐκκλησίαν *Church* by *Church*, that is, throw all particular Churches Act. 14. 23. With Tit. 1. 5. For if the Church is found to have had both ruleing and teaching Elders, Rom. 12. 8. 1. Cor 12. 28. 1. Tim. 5. 17. And upon the other hand, if thse lesser Societies are called [Churches] It certanly followes that they had *ane eldership & rule in them.* If ane eldership, and rulers, be allowed to rule and represent the Congregation in matters Ecclesiasticall, then by necessary consequence it followes, that the Call of the Pastor and Chieff elder

and

and his choice, as moſt ſuteable to their condition, muſt fall within the compaſſe of ther Spiritual authority.

Finally, the denying of this unto Congregations, & the Epiſcopal arbitrarie obtruding of Miniſters upon them without their call and conſent, is in two great points, contrare unto divine Reaſon. 1. Unto that *ſpiritual and near relation*, which is betwixt a Miniſter and his flock, (which we will find this pamphleter after plead) which is certainly marriage like and very ſtraite. And there being many *peculiar duties*, which they owe unto him beſide others Miniſters, all flowing from this relation, particularly a ſpecial reverence, obedience, and ſubjection; Theſe muſt certanely ſuppoſe a voluntarie conſent and call, and cannot be bottomed upon the meer will and pleaſure of another, which cannot make up this relation 2. This denying of the peoples right to call their Paſtor, is contrare unto that *Judgment of diſcretion, that ſpiritual diſcerning, and trying of the Spirits*, which is allowed, yea & enjoyned to the people of God; If in any thing a ſpiritual diſcerning muſt take place, ſurely in this eſpecially, to whom a people doe intruſt their ſoules direction and guidance; If in any thing a Chriſtian muſt Act in Faith, and not give up his perſwaſion to ane implicit conduct, and thus become a ſervant of men, ſure it muſt be, in a mater of ſo great weight as this is? If Chriſts ſheep have this for their Character, that they knowe the voice of the trew Shepherd from the voice of the *hyreling and ſtranger*, from whom they will flie, Joh. 10:4, 5. Sure their knowlege and conſent muſt interveen, in order to their acceptance of, and ſubjecton to their *Shepherd*? If they muſt not belive every Spirit, but try the Spirits, ſure this caution and tryal muſt be eſpecially allowed *in this caſe*, that they admitt not a falſe Prophet inſtead of a trew? So then the Epiſcopal Government, is in this,

as in other pointes, chargeable with antichriſtian and anti-ſcriptural tyrannie over Chriſts flockes.

10. The Epiſcopal Government is in this contrare unto the Word of God (viz.) In denying, and cutting off from his adminiſtration, and the totall laying aſyde of a ſingularely uſefull Church officer appointed by Chriſt in his Houſe (viz) *the ruleing elder*. That Government which denies and layes aſide, any of the great Maſter of the vine yeard, his ſervants and officers whom he hath authorized and appointed, muſt needs be highly derogatorie to his glory and contrare to his word; But ſuch is Prelacie. The Prelats are like that ſloathfull wicked ſervant who ſmites and beats away there fellow-ſervants, while they eat and drink with the drunken. That Prelats diſoun and exclude this officer, is evident both from their principles and practiſe. They all deny the divine warrand of this Church officer: And where Prelacy is eſtabliſhed, he is excluded from Presbyteries and Synodes, and upon the mater alſo, from the congregation: For they deny and exclude all deciſive ſuffrage there, and take away all Authority of congregational elderſhips, as we ſeen. Now that this ruleing elder, diſtinct from both the preaching Presbyter, and Deacon, Is appointed by God, our Divines have made good from ſeverall Scriptur grounds. Such as 1. From Rom. 12: 6, 7. Where among ſeverall other Church officers which the Apoſtle doth enumerat, there is a ὁ προϊστάμενος, or he that ruleth. Here is ane ordinary Ruler, diſtinct from all other Rulers, and Church officers, the word ὁ προϊστάμενος ſignifies *Rule* and authoritative power. Againe, he is ranked among *ordinarie Officers*, and ſo muſt needs be ane ordinary ſtanding officer, yet ſtands diſtinguiſhed from other ordinary officers, haveing both a *diſtinct name* from all the reſt, likewayes a *diſtinct worke*, as being diverſified from the *teacher*, *the exhorter*, *and the giver*. And moreover, a peculiar direction,

rection, as have likewise all the rest. So that from the circumstances of this place, the divine right of this officer, is clearly demonstrate. Nixt, That passage is pertinently improven for this purpose, 1 Cor. 12: 28. Where we read of *helps*, *Governments*, under distinct paragraphes, clearly pointing out ordinary Governing Church officers, distinct from the elders that preach, and the Deacon, and all other Church Governoures whatsoever. They cannot be Governoures in the General, for what doth this among a particular enumeration of officers? These are distinct from *helps*, distinct from the teaching elder, for he is already mentioned in this same vers. So here is a Rule, and Government, distinct from all governoures either civil or ecclesiastick, except this ruleing elder, yet set by God in the Church under the new Testament. But *the third* and most pregnant passage from which our divines doe demonstrate the divine right of this Church officer is that of the 1 Tim. 5: 17. Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and Doctrine. Here is a ruleing Church officer, distinct from the preaching elder: For here is a general, *elders*, Nixt, we have two distinct branches of these elders (viz) the *ruleing elder*, and the elder that both rules and *labours in the word and Doctrine*, in the word as the *Pastor*, In the Doctrine as the *teacher*. Again they are diversified in two distinct participles and epithets, [ruling] is made the marke and characterick of the one (viz) Ruling only: *And* [both Ruleing and teaching] is made the marke of the other, whereby they are distinguished in *their nature and office*. But in the 3d. place, the forementioned distinction eminently appears in the discretive [μαλιστα *especially*] which is set betwixt these two kynds of elders, intimating that as there were some of these ruling elders who did labour in the *word and Doctrin*, so there were others who did

*Rule* and not labour in the Word: Both were worthy of double honour, but *eſpecially* the labourer in the word, over and above this ruling. And to this purpoſe it is well obſerved, that the word μαλιστα *eſpecially*, is allwayes in the new Teſtament made uſe of to diſtinguiſh one thing from another. As when it is ſaid Gal. 6: 10. Let us doe good to all men, but μαλιστα *expecially*, to theſe of the houſhold of faith, hereby diſtinguiſhing toom that were of the houſhold of faith, and ſome that were not. In which ſenſe it is alſo uſed Phil. 4: 22. and 1 Tim. 5: 8, *This precept*, ſaith Piſcator (Anal: in Locum) *he firſt illuſtrats by a diſtribution and compariſon of things different and unlike; for he diſtinguiſhes elders into thoſe who were ſett over Eccleſiaſtick Diſciplin, yet ſo as they* did not publickly teach, & thoſe who did teach alſo: Wherein he clearly gives ſentence for us againſt the Prelatick partie, in this point. *Wee may hence Collect, that ther were two ſortes of elders at that time* (ſaith Calvin, on 1 Tim. 5: 17.) *For all were not ordained to teach; for the words doe manifeſtly hold forth that ſome had governed well and faithfully, to whom notwithſtanding the office of teaching was not committed. And trewly from among the people their were grave and good men choſen and approved, who did together with Paſtores, by commune Councell & authority adminiſter Church Government, and were in ſome ſort, cenſors for correcting of manners, which cuſtome Ambroſe compleans to have worme out of uſe, by the negligence, or rather the pryde of teachers while they covet to rule alone.* The pregnancy of this Scripture tramples into the duſt the pitiful evaſiones of all the Prelatiſts in denying the divine right of this officer: Some of which we ſhall here take notice of, and the confutation of the ſame, offered by our divines upon this point. Some, by *Ruleing well* will have *living well*, to be underſtood: But the Apoſtle is ſpeaking of the office of *ruling* in a *Church officer*, ruling over others, not of ruling over a mans ſelf in a privat capacitie. Neither is the Churches *Honorarium*. double

ble honour, double maintinance, due to living well, as here it is allowed to [ruling well] And this will ſay that the Miniſter that preaches not, is worthy of double honour for living well, which will make very harſh ſenſe. Some underſtand this ruleing elder, of the [Deacon,] but the Deacon is no where called πρεσβυτερος or elder, his work being to help, to diſtribut, not to rule. 1 Cor. 12, 28. Rom. 12, 8 Some would bring in under this [Ruler,] The *ancient Superannuat Bishop*; But this gloſs will in honour preferr unto him, the diligent preaching Miniſter, which will wound their cauſe to death. Some, by the [Ruler] will have ſuch underſtood as did adminiſter Sacraments, but preached not: But Paul knew non of theſe *non preaching* or *ſeldom-preaching* Miniſters, far leſs would he allow them a double honoure, who rather deſerved the contrary. Paul will have all Miniſters *apt to teach*, and able to convince. Some by the [ruling elder,] would have *Inferior Magiſtrats* underſtood, who were appointed for ending civil Striffes; but the Apoſtle is here preſcrybing rules to *Church office bearers*, not civile rulers, and teaching Timothy how to cary in the Church. Againe, they had then no Chriſtian civil Magiſtrats, as all doe grant, and for their going to Heathens to compoſe their civil differences, Paul himſelf diſſallowes it 1 Cor 6. Some againe will have the *laboring in the word & doctrine* to be nothing elſe but ane explanation of *ruleing well*; but this inadvertant gloſs will ſet aſyde *My Lord Bishop* as *no good ruler*. Againe, as is ſaid, the μαλιστα here, or the word [eſpecially] is diſcriminating, and diſcretive, diſtinguiſhing one thing from another, not explaining one thing by another. If μαλιστα were thus ſenſed, what odd work would it make in other places. 1 Tim. 4: 10. Who is the Saviour of all men, eſpecially [μαλιστα] of them that believe. This gloſs will ſenſe it thus, *the Saviour of all men great-*

*ly believing* Others yet, by [labouring in the word and doctrine] will have a higher degree of labouring *as to diligence*, understood, yet so as both branches speak of labouring in the word and doctrin; But (as the *Leyden Professoures* doe well answer) this will allow double honour to the less-labouring or lazie elder, who deserves rather a double rebuke, the Lord requiring the the utmost faithful diligence, of all labourers in his vineyarde. Besides that this glose justles out, and makes Superfluous that clause of the verse viz *in the word and doctrine*, which according to this exposition, should either have been totally omitted, or added unto both the branches of this sentence. Some, to escape the dint of this text, invent yet another Shift [all Sort of Rulers; whither civil, ecclesiastick, or domestical, are worthy of double honour; so they sense the first branch, and say they, this General propositon the Apostle might premise to enforce the honour he enjoyns to the labourer in the word, &c.] But the context fully rejects this glose, since the Apostle speaks not generally of Rulers, but of *elders that rule well*, and of such elders and rulers *to all which* he allowes double honour. So that this glose will mak pitiful work, both in allowing the Churches *honorarium*, double honour, or honourable maintinance, to domestick Rulers; and likewayes will allow more honourable maintinance to Ministers then Magistrats. Some woulde, by the *labourer in word und Doctrine*, as distinct from the *ruling elder*, take in transient visiting Presbyters, distinct from fixed preaches; but where will they shew us any such who were not Evangelists? Wee find that meer ordinary Presbyters, were ordained for several cities and places as there peculiar charges, whom they were fixedly to feed, Act. 14: 23. Tit. 1: 5. Act. 20: 28. But where find they such Presbyters as had no fixed charge. Neither can Evangelists be meaned (as Dr Burnet would

would gladely ſhift it in his firſt Dialogues) the Apoſtle all along ſpeaking of ordinary preaching Presbyters. Theſe, and ſeveral ſuch like exceptions, the evidence of this text hath long ſince refuted; So that we may conclude ſolidely from what is ſaid the divine right of this Church officer, and by conſequence the horride Sacriledge and uſurpation of Prelacie, in robbing Chriſts Church of the ſame: And likewiſe the Babiloniſh confuſion, which this Antichriſtian Hierarchie hath introduced into our Church: both in divyding and maiming the Paſtoral office, in bringing in offices which the *Great Shepherd* hath not allowed, and in excluding and thurſting our offices and officers which the hath ordained; upon which grounds, and upon all the preceeding, wee hope we may now ſafely conclude the *Dioceſian Prelat*, exiſting among us, to be *a plant which the father never planted*, and conſequently as a *poiſonus weed, to be rooted up.*

---

## Chap. V.

*That the preſent Prelacie is groſſe Eraſtianiſme. Some Arguments againſt it, under that notion. It excludes and denies all Church Government in the hands of Church officers, diſtinct from the civil; contrar to the Churches priviledge, both under the Old and New Teſtament, which is demonſtrat at large. Is in many points ane Incroachment upon the liberties of the Goſpel-Church, and upon Chriſts mediatorie authority over the ſame.*

HAving thus farr impugned the Dioceſian Prelat, as *a pretended Church officer*. Wee ſhall nixt, offer ſome Arguments againſt him in his *Eraſtian Mould*, as deriving all his power from the civil Magiſtrat. Althogh the office of the *Dioceſian Biſhop* were acknowledged warrantable, yet this will help nothing the *Eraſtian Prelat*, theſe being very diſtinct theams and queſtions. [What is that *Species of Church Government*, allowed and commanded in Scriptnre]? and [whither there be *any inherent Church Government*, allowed her, diſtinct from that of the Civil Magiſtrat?] and whither Church officers, or the Civil Magiſtrat, *be the proper Subject therof*? that the Preſent Prelacie is groſs Eraſtianiſme, is manifeſt; for after all Church Judicatories were in Anno 1662. diſcharged untill they were authorized by the Biſhops nominat by his Majeſtie —— the diſpoſal of the Government is declared to be the *Crown-right*, and *inherent p rpetual prerogative*: and thereupon the Biſhops are reſtored, not only to their civil dignities, but to their *Epiſcopal function*, *preſidencie in the Church* and over *all Church diſcipline*, &c. And it is expreſly declared, that there is no Church power, Jurisdiction or Government, in the Church office bearers or meetings, but what depends upon, and is ſubordinat unto the Supremacie, and is authorized by the Biſhops, who are declared accountable to his Majeſtie for their adminiſtration. In the *Act for the National Synod*, the conſtituent members thereof, the maters to be treated of, the authorizing of the conſtitutions as Church Canons, is ſoly in the Civil Magiſtrat, there work being only *to give advice* to him, without any deciſive inherent ſuffrage. By vertew of which Eccleſiaſtick Supremacie, his Majeſty puts excommunication and Spiritual cenſures, and conſequently *the power of the keys*, into the hands of perſons meerly civil, in the

Act

Act for the high commission. Hence it is aparent, that his Majesty as the fountaine of all Church Government, impartes this Authority to such as he pleases, and the Bishops are nothing else but his Majesties Commissioners in the exercise of that Ecclesiastick Power, which is originally in himself. Now, that this Erastian Prelacie, or Church Government, is a stranger to the Scripture, is many wayes evident.

1. This Erastian Prelacie, *Denyes all Church Government in the hands of Church officers, distinct from civil Magistracie*: which is ane error fully confuted and largely baffled by all who have written against *Erastus* and his followers, and is contrare many wayes to Scripture. I. To that distinction betwixt the Ecclesiastick and civil *Sanhedrin* under the Old Testameet, afferted and cleared by many Scripture Arguments by our divines, paraicularly *Mr Gillespie in the Aarons rode.* I. From the institution of that Court of elders, supposed in *Exod.* 24. Who were not those elders chosen for the government of the Commonwealth, *Numb.* 11. For this was done *at Sinai* shortly after they came out of *Egypt* But on the 20 day Of the 2d. Moneth in the 2d. Year they tooke their journey from Sinai to the wildernes of Paran *Numbr.* 10 11, 12. And there pitched, when the *Seventie* elders were chosen to relieve Moses. They were not the judges chosen by advyce of *Iethro*, for he came not to Moses till the end of the first year, or the beginning of the Second after they came out of Egypt; Nor could they be judges, who judged befor he came; for he observed that the burdine lay upon Moses alone. So they must needs have been Ecclesiastick Rulers under the presidencie of *Aarone and Hur. vers.* 14. Who were called up as the representatives of the Church of Israel, after the Judicial lawes were given, Chap. 22. 23. In this 24. Chapter there is a transition to the Ceremonial lawes, concerning the worship of God, and the Structur of the Tabernacle.

Deutr. 17. 8, 9, 10. All grant there a Supream Court of judges, therfor also the text must be granted to hold forth a Supreme Ecclesiastick Court: For it caryes the authority & sentence of the *priests*, as hie as the authority & sentence of the judges, & that in a disjunctive way as Two distinct powers, each binding respective in their oun proper Sphere. 3. From these juiges & officers 1. Chr. 23. 4, & 26: 29. Supposed, & sett to their work when the Levits were divyded to there Charge, who were not tyed to service & attendances in the Temple, but *to judge* & give sentence concerning the law & its meaning: and this saith the text, *over Israel*, coming to them from any of the cities of the land. 4. From Jehoshaphats reformation. 2. Chron. 19. 8, 10, 11. Who restoring the government of the Church, did sett in *Jerusalem levits, priests*, Chieff of the Fathers of *Israel for the judgment of the Lord, & for controversies Here is* 1. A Court of priests & *Levits* with power of Suffrage & thus consisting of *Ecclesiastick membres*. 2. *In Ecclesiastick matters*, Maters of the Lord, distinct from *Maters of the King* 3. For ane Ecclesiastick *end* (viz.) to warne that they trespasse not, not only against one another, but *against the Lord*. 4. All causes of their Brethren that dwelt in the Cities, were to come to them unto Jerusalem. 5. They have *Ane Ecclesiastick* [*Moderator*, or president, *Amariah* the chieff priest, over them in all Maters of the Lord, distinct (as is said) from Maters of the King. These & many such Arguments are made use of by him & others, To clear this poynt of the Two distinct *Sanhedrins*, which fully overthrowes this *Erastian Confusion* of these two powers & governments. 2. This fountaining of all Church power in the civil, and denying of Church government in the hands of Church officers, distinct from the Civil government, is Croff to that distinction of the *Gospel Church her government*, from that of the Civil power, wich is clearly held out in *the new Testament*. Wherin it is evi-

dent

dent 1. That the visible Church is Christ the Mediator his visible kingdome as Mediator. And so its Officers, Lawes, & Censures falls with in the compasse of his *Mediatorie appointment and inspection*. Matth. 16. 19. —— & 28. 29. Joh. 18. 36. 1. Cor. 12. 28. Eph. 4. 11, 12. —— 2. That the gospel Church was *Compleated in her being & essence*, both as to Rulers & Ruled, Members & officers, and in rules & directions for the exercise of her government accordingly, when no Magistrat was so much as *a member of her*. —— 3 That in all the *precepts* anent the *exercise of this power*, it is enjoyned to *the Church*, & to these Church officers, *as such*, with the same freedome & independancy upon the Civil power, as at the first, & without the least restriction & limitation, in case of the Magistrats becoming Christian; All the grounds made use of in pressing the exercise of this power, being *moral & perpetual*, & respecting the Church her condition *as a Church*, whither the Magistrat be friend or enemie.

In the 2d. Place, This Erastian prelatick mould of government, brings in many grosse encroachments upon the *liberties* of the gospell Church. As 1. Denying her liberty to exercise her power & *Key of Censure* without the Magistrat: Contrare to all the *New Testament instances* of the exercise therof with out him. 2. Introduceing a *dominion*, & arbitrary power upon all her government; Contrare to her liberty & the very *nature* of her government, which is a *Ministerial Stewardship*, not a dominion; for thus the Church is the proper object of the Magistrats dominion that being the Nature of his power *Rom.* 13. And the present prelatick Church ounes the Supreme Civil governoure as her *Chieff Church officerer*. —— 3. Giving to the Magistrat *qua talis* (for this power in Church matters, is by Prelats and their adherents aknowledged to be *a perpetual Croun-right*) the proper & Sole *decisive suffrage in all causes* falling under Eccleſiastick cogni-

cogniſance: for Prelatiſts onely meet to adviſe him in there Suprem Court or *national Synod*, according to the forementioned *Act*. Now, this Cutts off all Church judicatories ther deciſive ſuſirage as Church judicatories, which (as is cleared above) they did fully at firſt exerciſe of themſelves, without the Magiſtrat. 4. This mould will make the Civil Magiſtrat *the proper immediat ſubject of the Keys*, and Impartes all Church government to One, who, as ſuch, is not ſo much as *a Church member*, and impowers him to give out this ſuppoſed fountaine power to no Church members, or to here enemies at his pleaſure, As his Majeſty gives to perſons Civil the power of excomunication? Yea it gives him a power, by his *oun proper elicite acts*, to diſpenſe all her [external government] as the law terms it, which (if we look upon it as including *all externall ordinances* contradiſtinct from the internal government of the inward man, & the Church inviſible) will neceſſarely import & include the exerciſe of *both the Keys*, & all the external *dogmaticke, diatactick, & Critick* authority & power, intruſted to the Church repreſentative: Which is a meer Civil papacie & the groſſeſt of uſurpations which the Church can be expoſed unto, as ſhall be afterward touched. Finally, This will inferr, that Children, Heathens, yea women, may be chieff Church officers and heads of the Church too, ſince they may poſſeſſe the Crown of theſe Kingdoms, to which this Headſhip and Supremacy is annexed. But of this alſo againe.

3. This Eraſtian government is a groſſ encroachment upon *Chriſts prerogative over his Church*. And that in theſe wayes. 1. In aſſumeing a power over the Church which is proper to Chriſt only, I mean *a Magiſterial, architectonick power*. That this is aſſumed by this Eraſtian mould of government, is evident? He who can diſpoſe of government, and governoures of the Church arbitrarly, and diſpoſe of all *Church meetings, and Church maters, as he*

*pleaſes*

*pleaſes and thinks fitt*, Hath certanly this power; but that this Magiſterial, architectonick, power and dominion over the Church, is Chriſts Sole prerogative, is abundantly clear by manifold plaine, poſitive, Scripture aſſertions. To Chriſt is all power given in Heaven and Earth, Matth. 28. 18. And he, as Mediator, is given to be head over all things to the Church, Epheſ. 1. 21, 22. To him is all judgement (over her) committed, John. 5. 22. Hee it is alſo who poſſeſſes theſe high tittles, to be the *Governoure* (over his Church) by way of eminencie, Matth. 2. 6. That *great shepherd of the sheep*. Hebr. 13. 20. *the shepherd and Bishop of Soules*. 1. Pet. 2. 25. Hee is that *one Maſter* over all Church officers, who are but *Brethren*, Matth. 23. 8, 10. To us there is but *One Lord Ieſus*. 1. Cor. 8. 6. Hee it is, to whom onely the *imperiall acts* of power are aſcribed: as, the giving of lawes to his Church, the goſpel precepts are *his law*. Gal. 6. 2. Hee it is who gave commandments to his Apoſtles, Act. 1. 2. there is but *one law giver* who can ſave and deſtroy. Jam. 4. 12. The Lord is our judge, the Lord is our lawgiver or Statute maker, the Lord is our King, Iſay. 33 22. He it is who Conſtitutes her ordinances, preaching of the word Matth. 10. 7. 1. Cor. 1. 17. adminiſtration of the Sacraments, as of baptiſme, John. 1. 33. the Lords Supper, 1. Cor. 11. 20. diſpenſing of Cenſures, Matth. 16. 29. Hee it is who appointes his Officers, Prophets, Paſtores, Teachers, Epheſ. 4. 11, 12. 1. Cor. 12, 28. In his name onely all ordinances are diſpenſed: Not in the name of Magiſtrats, or of any Mortall. The Apoſtles ſpake and taught in the name of Jeſus. Act. 4. 17, 18. In his name we are to Ask Joh. 14. 13, 14. In his name onely Miniſters are to preach and baptize, Matth. 28. 18, 19. 2. Cor. 5. 20. In his name onely they are to Cenſure, to deliver to Satan. 1 Cor. 5. 4. In his name only Church aſſemblies are to be gathered, which ſeems the Smalleſt Act. Matth. 18. 20.

[See

(See *jus divinum Regim: Eccleſ: Appollon: Revius. &c.*

2. This Eraſtian government incroaches upon Chriſts prerogatives, In taking and uſing the Keys againſt *Chriſts donation and authoritie* Chriſt is the *only Lord giver* of both the Keys, and all their power. But, in this Uſurped power, the Keys are 1. *Divyded*, againſt his preſcription, who gave *both the Keys of Doctrine and Diſcipline jointly* to the proper recipients thereof (viz.) Church officers. Matth. 16. 19. This Eraſtian government inacches away *One Key* (viz. of government) from ſuch to whom Chriſt the great Maſter of the Houſe, hath Intruſted *both*. Chriſt in this donation of the Keys, making no mention of the *Civil Rulers*, but only of *Church Officers* then appointed, who were diſtinct from the Magiſtrat. Hence 2. The Key of diſciplin is taken and uſed againſt his mynde, by theſe to whom he hath not Intruſted it, which is a great encroachement upon his authoritie. In the 3d. place, this Eraſtian government encroaches upon Chriſts authoritie over his Church, *In ſuperadding Ane officer* to theſe Church officers inſtitut and appointed by him. For in all the Scripture rolls of Chriſts Church officers, *the Civil Rulers* are not found. Eph. 4. 10, 11. 1. Cor. 12. 28. Rom. 6, 7, 8. —— 4. This encroachment appeares in making Church officers, as ſuch, *imediatly ſubject to the Magiſtrat in all their Spirituall adminiſtration*, which is a hie Cenſure of the primitive exercise of this power independantly, as we ſhal ſhew. 5. In exeeming him from all Spiritual ſubjection unto, and cenſure by, Church Rulers. For where, I pray, ſhal we find the Magiſtrat excepted, and the hier Civil powers, if within the Church, from Chriſts lawes and rules anent ſubjection to Church cenſures and to his Spiritual office bearers intruſted therewith?

---

## Chap. VI.

*Eraſtianiſm denyes the compleat conſtitution of the Apoſtolick Church in point of Government. Removes the Scriptur Land-markes, ſet to diſtinguish the Civil and Eccleſiaſtick Powers, which is cleared in ſeveral points. It is lyable to great abſurdities.*

IN the 4th place: This Eraſtian Government preſumes to impeach *the primitive Apoſtolick Church*, *her compleat conſtitution and faithfulneſs of Adminiſtration in relation to Government*, and makes here to have had but a defective maimed conſtitution and authority thereanent, while the exerciſe of the civil power in her, was wanting. Which charges a groſs deficiency upon Chriſts preſcriptions in relation to her Lawes and Officers: Which are found in Scripture, very full, and ſuited to her ſtate and condition *in all times* until all the Elect be made up, and here warfare is accompliſhed; and conſequently, it impeaches Chriſts faithfulneſs and authority as Mediatour, whoſe proper work this holy conſtitution is

5. This Eraſtian Prelacy takes away all the *Scripture Land marks and Limits*, which are fixed therien by God, to diſtinguiſh the *Civil and Eccleſiaſtick Powers and Governments*, and makes them every way the ſame, in all things wherein Scripture and Reaſon do diſtinguiſh them, both as to their *Nature and Acts*, and likewayes as to their *Cauſes*.

1. As to their *Nature*, this Eraſtian Government doth confound them. 1. In that it makes the *Church* and *Commonwealth*, the Political and Eccleſiaſtical Societies, *one and the ſame*, which are formally diſtinct.

It

It being a visible profession that make a Church member, and outward habitation and subjection to the civil power, that makes a Subject; Which may be where there is no profession, and consequently no Church-membership. For in this mould, the Kings Government Civil, is Church Government, for it is *his Government as King*, in which capacity this Ecclesiastick Supremacy is his prerogative, and his *Ecclesiastick Government* is also *Civil Government*, for it is his Government as the *Supream Civil Magistrat*: And thus the Church, respected by his government, is the Commonwealth, *& vice versa*. 2. This confounds the *Officers* of Church and State, which the Scriptur doth aboundantly distinguish. For, as is said, The Church had all her Officers of Christs appointment, when no Magistrat was a Member thereof; and on the other hand, Commonwealths had all their civil Rulers, before they became Churches; But in this Erastian Prelacy, this order is confounded, The chief Officers of this Church are the Magistrats Commissioners to Church and State; whereas Church Officers are given by Christ as Mediatour to his Church as a Church, 1 Cor. 12: Ver. 28. ——— 3. *The actings* of civil and Ecclesiastick authority are thus confounded, Spiritual church Rulers *Act onely in Spiritual matters* by Gods appointment, and civil Rulers there immediat proper *Acts are only in matters Civil*. But here Church Officers *are Parliament Commissioners*, and civil Rulers in the high commission *do excommunicat*.

Againe in the 2. place: This Erastian Prelacy confounds these two powers in their *causes*, which are wholly diverse. 1. The efficient cause is diverse, *God as Creator*, is Author of Magistracy, Rom. 13. But *Christ as Mediatour* appoints Church Government, Matt. 28: 18. But here, the Magistrat *qua talis*, is a suprem Church Ruler? And thus is supposed to have his power *from Christ as Mediator and Head of his Church*: Which is

ane

ane opinion fully confuted by thoſe who have written a-gainſt *Eraſtus*, particularly *Mr Gilleſpie* in the *Aarons Rod*. 2. They differ in the *material* cauſe, the matter on which the two powers do act, are diverſe: Eccleſiaſtick power doth act in the exerciſe of the *Keys*, the adminiſtration of the Word and Sacraments, having this for its proper *Object and matter*. The civil power conſiſts in the civil and ſecular Sword; the one reaches the inward, the othere the outward man. But in this Eraſtian Prelacye, the, *Sword and Keys*, are made one, promiſcuouſly uſed, and put into the ſame hands. 3. The two powers differ in their *formal cauſe*: the civil power is put forth in *political punishments*, the Eccleſiaſtick in *ſpiritual cenſures*. But here, the ſame power is the firſt *Radix* and Fountaine of Spirituall Cenſures, and Civill puuiſhments, and gives them their formal eſſence and being, as ſuch. Finalie. The proper immediat *end* of Civil power is the *Temporal*, *External*, *political peace* of the commonwealth. *Rom.* 13. 1, 2. 3. But the *proper end* of Eccleſiaſtick power, *Is the Churches Spiriual good and edification* as ſuch, *Matth.* 18. 15. 1 *Cor.* 5. 5. 2. *Cor.* 10. 8. and 13. 10. But here, the Magiſtrat *qua talis*, being the Churches head, theſe ends are Confounded. Theſe and ſeveral ſuch like arguments are made uſe of by our writers againſt *Eraſtus*, which doe fully evince the unlawfulnes of this Eraſtian prelacie. Whoſoever ſhal peruſe *Apollonius* His *jus Majeſt: Circ: Sacr:* the *jus Div: regim: Eccleſ:* the *Aarons rod*, *wallæus* againſt *Vtenbog*: and ſuch like, will find this abundantly clear.

To ſhut up all with One word more. Ther are theſe 3. *horride abſurdities*, in relation to Church government, which the premiſed mould of this *Eraſtian* prelacie will neceſſarly inferr. 1. That a man may be *borne*, not only a Church member, but *a Chief Church Ruler*: *Nay*, that a Heathen, and a man that never profeſſed the true religion, but lives and dies ane ingraind enemie to it, and

ſo hath neither *mater* nor *forme*, of Church membership, may be a Chieff Church officer. For his Majeſties preſent authoritie herine (acknowledged by our prelats, and which is the Fountaine of their power) is the proper *Crowne dignitie* of all that ever ſhall poſſeſſe and wear it: and ſo here is a monſtrous Church officer, who 1. hath *no qualifications* of any Church officer whom ever Chriſt appointed. 2. A Church officer who is not *Set in the Church* (which is the eſſential marke of all Church officers 1. *Cor.* 12 28.) for that ſuppoſes he muſt be *a Church member* A 2d. *abſurditie* is this, *That Children and women* (who may have a lawfull lineal right to the Croun) may be *Church officers*, Yea the Fountaine of our prelats authority, and of all their Underlings, and the chieff governoure of this Church; and thus, they who are forbidden ſo much as *to ſpeak in the Church*, ſhall be Chieff *Church Rulers*, and likewayes ſuch as have not the uſe of Reaſon. 1. *Tim.* 3 5. 1 *Cor.* 14. 34 35. ——— A 3d. *abſurditie* is, That the Church government upon earth may be *Monarchical*, and that One man may be her Supream head, legislator, And architectonick Monarch and Ruler, for *a quatenus, ad omne, valet conſequentia.* Upon the ſame ground that the Suprem Civil Ruler is Chieff head and Ruler over the Church in his dominions, the Church in all other places, being a body of the ſame nature, Should the Chriſtian Church be contracted within his dominions, he were her *Supreme univerſall head*? And it were ſo, if his Civil dominion ſhould be extended over all the Churches: By this ſame reaſon of his headſhip over *One*, he may be head over all, and exerciſe ane arbitrary at leaſt a *legiſlative* power over all her ordinances and officers. And if this will not Clearly ſet the popes *Treeple Croun* upon his head, and diſowne all that ever the proteſtant Churches have writen and acted againſt his blaſphemous Supremacie, let common diſcretion judge. *Ambroſe* (*Epiſt.* 33. *ad valen-*

*lentinianum imperatorem*) Saith, *noli gravare imperator, ut putes in ea quæ divina ſunt, aliquod imperiale jus habere, politicorum tibi munerum jus conceſſum eſt, non Sacrorum.* Grieve not O Emperour, ſo as to think that you have any Imperial authority over theſe things which are divine, the right or authority of politicall offices is committed unto thee, but not of Sacred.

## Chap. VII.

*The Informers deceitfull ſhifting and obſcuring the true State of the Queſtion anent Epiſcopacie, and flinching from the point debatable, diſcovered Severall wayes. He declines a direct pleading for prelats civil offices, Yet offers ſome arguments defence therof: Wherin his prevarication, and Contradiction to himſelf, is made appear.*

TO come now to examine what this new Dialogiſt, hath produced in defence of the preſent prelacie eſtabliſhed amongſt us, And to examine his anſwers to our plea againſt it; We ſhall not ſtand upon the trifling debate about the perſonal good qualities of ſome that have been prelats, with which Hee prefaces this Dialogue, it being altogether extrinſick to the Queſtion anent the lawfulnes of the *office it ſelf*, And would be no argument in our caſe againſt him, as this man cannot but acknowledge, elſe Hee muſt give up the cauſe, upon his conceſſion of the Unqueſtionable eminent pietie, and integritie, of many burning and Shining lights, who have been the Lords Conſtant witneſſes againſt prelacie. That which is here mainely conſiderable, Is his prevarication in Stating the Queſtion anent prelacie, (viz.) [ *Whither the ancient Bishopes had a*

*Superioritie over other Miniſters* ] wherin he utterly *ſtrikes* away from the poinre debeatable. 1. In making this the State of the Queſtion [ what Biſhopes were in the primitive Church ] whereas the true State of our Queſtion, is, *whither the prelat now exiſtent in this Church, be a Scripture-Bishop and conſonant thereunto, Or, ane officer appointed by Chriſt in his houſe, Yea or not.* And not whither there have been Biſhops, or ſuch as we now have, in the ancient Church. The Queſtion is not of the mater of *fact*, but of the *right*, yea and *the divine right* of the preſent prelats in relation to their power. 2. In ſtating the difference betuixt the Biſhop he pleads for, and the Paſtor, Hee Smoothes it over in this general, [ whither there have been ſuch Biſhopes, as have had *a Superioritie over ordinarie Miniſters* ] but doth not explaine what that *Superioritie* is which he pleads for, whither of order or jurifdiction, or both; whither ſpecificall, or graduall; Whither a Superiority of meer preſidencie, or of principality; The [Epiſcopus preſes, and princeps] ſharing in this general name. Dolus latet in generalibus: Since there have been various Superiorities, *de facto*, He ſhould have particularized that Superiority which He undertaks to defend. 3. His *Doubter* ſuggeſting [ that they were not *Lord Bishopes* ] He muſt needs make him referr to 1. Pet. 5. 3. Diſcharging to Lord it over Gods heritage; But how poor is his evaſion from and ſolution of this difficultie, in ſtarting this notion [ whither there have been, *De facto*, Biſhops with a Superioritie over Preſbiters, Or Biſhops who had Civill dignities in ancient times? ] The pinch of this debate lying in this, whither the [ κατακυριευοντες Or Lorſhip ] diſcharged in that Scripture, will not ſtryke againſt ſuch a Superiority or dominion, whither in Eccleſiaſtick, or Civil rule, as our prelats now aſſume? and not what ſort of Superiority in Eccleſiaſtick, or Civill government, prelats have formerly

ly had. The preſent prelat exiſtent in Scotland, having ſuch a dominion over Church Judicatories, and likwayes in Civils, as is above expreſt, and derving all his power from the Magiſtrat in Eccleſiaſtick, as well as in Civil rule, He ſhould have Stated his Queſtion thus diſtinctly, and then fenced for *his great Diana*. But the man probably found this a taske which he durſt not undertake: which appears immediatly after, in his declining the debate anent the Biſhopes Civil rule, telling us, [That he will make it none of his worke to debate with us, their acting in Civil affairs, Sometimes] But 1. Since he undertaks the patrocinie and defence of Epiſcopacie now eſtabliſhed among us, And in his preface profeſſes it his deſigne to prove it lawfull, and therby to take off one of our arguments for withdrawing from Conformiſts, And it being likewayes Certaine that the preſent prelats are Civil rulers, He muſt either undertake this debate, or acknowledge them *unlawfull pro tanto* at leaſt? And that he proves but a maimed pleader for their preſent office, and falls ſhort of a great part of his deſigne in this pamphlet. 2. He pitifully Snakes away from this debate alſo, in minching their State-medling, thus, (viz.) *Their acting in Civil affaires Sometimes*, which may be ſaid of any man or Miniſter, His rare tranſient, occaſional, accidentall or privat actings, and even in domeſtick affairs. But cannot this man diſtinguiſh betuixt this, and *a Stated official acting, as conſtituent and conſtant members of Civill judicatories*, as prelats are according to our lawes, and that even *ex natura officij* as they are prelats; Sure, he cannot diſtinguiſh the Mountaine from the Molehill, that cannot ſee a difference betuixt theſe. Either this Informer muſt account the prelats preſent State actings lawful, or not? If He account them lawfull, then He falls under a Three fold premunire in this point. 1. In declyning the defence of one of the prelats Unqueſtiona-

ble legal privileges (disowned by presbyterians, and by him esteemed lawfull) notwithstanding of his undertakeing to plead for them. 2. In Undertaking only tos plead for their *acting Sometimes*, which (as I said) i far from the point and matter of fact, which he must defend. 3. In confessing at the foot of the page [That Church men should not *needlesslie, or of Choice*, intangle themselves in these incumberances] wherin he palpablie contradicts himself as to his Scope. For doe not our prelats of *most free choice and deliberatly* assume State Imployments? Or are their shoulders burdened against their will with these State honoures? Besydes, He cites 2. Tim. 2. 4. In acknowledging this intanglement in wordly affaires, to be unlawfull in Church men; The text sayes, no man that warreth entangleth himself in affaires of this life. Now, if this text discharge universally, and absolutly, a Ministers intanglement in wordly affaires, How comes he to *foist* in his *limitation* of [*needlesly, or of Choice*] where is this *limitation* in the *text*? If all intanglements or incumberances, as such, be unlawfull, as is here expresly asserted, as being inconsistant with the *nature and importance* of the Ministers Spirituall function, which requires the greatest abstractednes from all worldly things, and the mans constant *waiting upon, and giving himself wholly unto* the things of God; Then surely whither he intangle himself by choice, or not, it is still *ane intanglement*, and consequently sinfull; his acting deliberatly is but ane agravation. Againe, since He maks ane intanglement *Of choice, to be a needles intanglement*, and consequently sinfull, He must needs acknowledge that such is the present prelatick medling, which, as is said, He cannot deny to be most deliberat and of choice. But nixt, If He account our prelats State-actings unlawfull? Then 1. Why doth He not *in terminis* acknowledge so much, and not lisp it half out? 2. Why doth He alleadge some-

thing

thing from Scripture precedents to prove it warrantable? But Let us hear his Scripture arguments wherby He would prove this State acting lawfull. His firſt Reaſon is [ That the jewiſh *Sanhedrin* made up of the Sevinty elders, Moſes aſſiſtants in Civill government, did conſiſt partly of prieſts ] where 1. Wee ſee He overſtraines his point, and overſtretches himſelf in his pretended proofe; for the *Theſe* he undertaks to prove, is, [That Church men may act in State matters though not *of Choice*, and ſo that it be *Sometimes only*] which he cannot but diſtinguiſh from a *Conſtant official medling*, if he ſpeak ſenſe. And to prove this, He brings ane inſtance of prieſts under the old Teſtament-diſpenſation, their being *conſtituent members of a civil court*? Now, how doe theſe quadrat? Were not theſe prieſts to act *deliberatly and of Choice*? If this prove any thing at all it will prove that Miniſters (as being ſuch members) may deliberatly and of choyce involve themſelves in Civill affairs, which this man holds to be diſcharged 2. Tim. 2. 4. And ſo this Reaſon, becauſe proving too much, and beyond his aſſertion, proves juſt nothing. 2. As we cleared above, the difference betuixt the Civil and Eccleſiaſtick *Sanhedrin*, and that thoſe Sevinty, mentioned in the 11. Numbr. who were choſen for the government of the Commonwealth, are diſtinct from thoſe mentioned Exod. 24. Who were Eccleſiaſtick and not Civil officers; So it is more then this Informer hath offered proof of, that there were prieſts in that Civil Court, ſince as is ſaid, the Two Sanhedrins Civil and Eccleſiaſtick, did conſiſt of diſtinct members, and there was not one Sanhedrin only, as this man ſeems to ſuppoſe. But 3. Though the concurrence of ſome preiſts in that Civill Court, were granted, Our writers have abundantly cleared the inconſequenc of any argument drawn from that inſtance as to this point, In that though the Civil and Eccleſiaſtick

Sanhedrin, were distinct originaly, Yet the judiciall Civil law being given immediatly by God to the Jewes, as well as the Moral and Ceremonial, the priests by consequence, under that dispensation, had a most necessary interest as to its *interpretation & decision* in many cases, for the law was to be sought at their mouth. The difference of which condition of the *jewish*, from that of the *Christian* Church (Spread over the world, and in Countreys where are different moulds of Civil government and lawes, and which are not tyed to that judicial law) doth cast the ballances and overthrow his argument. As for that of deutr. 17. Wee have seen how it holds out a Twofold *Sanhedrin* which had distinct *members, acts, and objects.* In a word, if his argument from this instance were good (upon his supposition that priests were members in that Court) it would prove that Christians could not have a lawful civil Supreme Judicatorie, unles Ministers were constituent members thereof? And that Ministers were essentially & necessarly *ex natura officii* (as these priests) constituent members of civil Judicatories? which is more then he dare assert, and the absurdity thereof is above cleared. His 2d. Ground is drawn from [the examples and instances of Eli the Priest who judged Israel fourty years, and of Samuel the Prophet, who, though lent to the Lord from his birth, yet went in circuit yearly judging the people] But 1. The force of this reason leaning upon ane *example* meerly, of Church officers under the old dispensation, and the *gratis supposed imitablenes* thereof, it is (like the other argument) very unsound and lax. He will not dare to averr that every deduction *a facto ad jus*, is sound; All scripture examples, are for our *improvement*, but not for our *imitation.* Even good and laudable Acts of the Saints, are of this nature, many of them. Some were heroical, as Elias bringing fire from hea-

ven

ven, which the Lord diſcharged James and John to imitat. Phinehas his Act, he will ſay with his Maſter the ſurveyer, was of this nature. Some Acts did flow from ane extraordinarie emergent of Providence, and a call flowing therefrom, as Abrahams attempt to offer his Son, Iſraels borrowing from the Egyptians and not paying. Some Acts had their iſſue from a tranſient and occaſional junctur, procuring a neceſſity pro tunc, as Pauls preaching *gratis*, and working with his hands. Some acts were to confirme a ſpecial extraordinary call, So our Lords fourty dayes faſt, and that of Moſes his tipe. Now, to conclud from the premiſed inſtances, the lawfulneſs of theſe Acts (viz) Sacrificing Children, borrowing and not paying, the popiſh *quadrantum* &c, This Informer will grant to be very poor and childiſh Sophriſtrie, yet ſuch is his reaſoning here. 2. Divines doe tell us that theſe examples only are imitable, whoſe ground and ſcope are of a *moral nature*, which the perſons did, as ſaints or Chriſtians: ſuch are all examples of morall ſtanding duties enjoyned in the commands. They tell us. 3. That there are two Rules neceſſarly to be obſerved (and which this Informer muſt of neceſſity grant) as to a concluſion, ab *exemplo ad factum*, or *a facto ad jus*, which cutts the ſinnews of his argument here. 1. No *example* which croſſes *a morall precept* can ground a Rule, for this would make the Rule croſſe it ſelf. And to bring this neer the point in hand, I will ſhew, that *this Informer* fights againſt himſelf, and muſt needs admitt this anſwer, from the very mould of his argument: For he thinks to imforce the Inſtance from Samuel his civill actings, by telling us that *he was lent to the Lord from his mothers womb*: Which will ſay, according to his pleading, That a man though ſingularly devoted to God in the ſacred Miniſtry, yet may deliberatly and of choice become a civil judge, yea

a ſupreme civil judge; and then I would know, how he will reconcile this with the great goſpel precept 2 Tim. 2: 4. Which himſelf pleads as diſcharging deliberat medling in civil affairs, becauſe the ſacred Miniſtery is a warfare, or a dedication of the Miniſter to the ſervice of Chriſt? And what will he ſay if one ſhall argue thus, if a Miniſter, though dedicat to the Lord from his mothers womb, may notwithſtanding become a civil judge, then the Miniſtry its being a warrfare under Chriſt, cannot hinder a mans medling by choice in civill affaires, which notwithſtanding he denyes: So that either he muſt diſown this Inſtance, or his ſenſe of that Goſpell precept. But of this againe. 2. No *examples* of Acts done from ane *extraordinary calling & gifts*, are to be imitated by ſuch as have *neither the one, nor the other*. Wee will find our *Informer* afterward grant this in relation to the Apoſtles, & that there are many things depending upon ſpecial emergents that are not imitable in them. And if he ſhould deny this Rule, as he will contradict himſelf, ſo he will not evite a great inconvenience from the fact of Phinehas, from Ehud, &c. Incaſe ſome perſon of a boiſtrous heart, and unruly hand, ſhould plead theſe inſtances to offer violence unto him. Beſide, if this rule be not admitted, he will brangle the boundarie and limits of *different ordinary callings*, (and relations by conſequence) which the God of order hath fixed. The examples of *Magiſtratical* or *Miniſteriall duties*, obliges not *privat perſons* to ane imitation; The Apoſtolick Acts of working Miracles, giving the Spirit by laying one of hands, univerſal unfixed preaching (he will grant) are not imitable (as neither the peculiar duties of Relations among privat perſons, doe obleige every one) becauſe theſe extraordinary gifts and callings are now gone: And ſo ſay I of theſe examples of Eli, and Samuel, who are by all ſound divines ranked among *the judges* whoſe call and office

fice is acknowledged to have been *extraordinary*; God keeping at that time the regal rights in his own hand, befor he ſet up any fixt ordinary Rulers and Kings, and creating, & calling extraordinarly, his owne deputies in the Government, ſometimes out of one tribe, and ſometimes out of another, whoſe authority died with themſelves and admitted of no ſucceſſion. Wherfore *Gideon* told the people that God was their King, and refuſed that office when offered; and the peoples guilt in wearing of this holy immediat Government of God himſelf, and deſiring a King, is aggravated from this, That they had rejected God who was their King. So that his argument from theſe *extraordinary* inſtances, is wholly inconcludent; it being from ane *extraordinary*, to ane *ordinary calling*, from ane extraordinary *factum*, to ane ordinary *jus*; which is conſequence we will find himſelf afterward diſown. And if he ſtraine theſe inſtances, they will prove too much, (viz.) That Miniſters may be *Kings*, or *ſupreme civil judges*; which I believe he will not adventure to plead for, ſince what ever thanks he may merite for this from the Pope, yet Royaliſts will allow him none.

If, in a matter ſo plain and evident, it were needfull to adduc teſtimonies of writers and commentators (as this informer doth to no purpoſe) how harmonious would their conſent appear unto this truth. The Engliſh Annot: in their preface upon the book of judges, will tell him that *the judges were not ordinary Magiſtrats, but extraordinarly called of God in times of great extremity &c.* And in their preface on the firſt book of Samuel, they ſhew, that it containes the Hiſtory *of the two laſt judges, Eli, and Samuel*, and of Saul the firſt King of Iſrael. And upon that place, Chap. 7: 15, 16. Anent Samuels judging of Iſrael, notwithſtanding of his being lent to the Lord from his birth, 1 Chap. 28. They will Inform this informer [that as this was the juriſdiction of a judge, which God called him unto all the time of ſaul, —— ſo, *he was quo*

*dam*

*bound by his Mothers vow*, Chap. 1. Whereby he was devoted to the ſervice of the ſanctuary, to continue his reſidence there, both becauſe God had forſaken it for the ſins of the Prieſts, and alſo, *becauſe the Lord himſelf had taken him off from that levitical ſervice, and called him to another imployment, namely, to be a holy Prophet and a judge over his people*, which places he could not diſcharge, if he had been confined to a ſettled place. ] The du. ch. Annot: in the argument of the book of judges, deſcribe them [to be ſuch perſons, not ( who adminiſtred *the ordinary function of judges* among the people, as the Word is other where taken, but ) whom God now and then as the ſtate of Iſrael required, ſometimes out of on tribe, ſometimes out of another, *extraordinarly raiſed, called, and with his Spirit of wiſdome and couradge endewed &c.* In the argument, of the firſt book of Samuel, they ſhew that therin is deſcribed the Government *of Samuel as judge over Iſrael &c* ] So that until our Informer ſhall inſtruct the Prelats extraordinary call from God, and alſo their extraordinary enduements for civil Government, theſe inſtances of Eli and Samuel, will not [in the Judgment of theſe divines] afford them the leaſt ſhaddow of warrand for there civil offices. So this man may be aſhamed that he ever mentioned ſuch an argument.

*Finally*, That Hee is in the breers of a contradiction here, is (as is hinted) evident; in that to prove that Church men ſhould not of Choice medle in Civil affaires, he gives this reaſon, *for*, *no man that warreth intangleth himſelf with the affaires of this life. 2. Tim. 2. 4.* Now, if this [*for*] or illative here, ſignifie any thing, and be not nonienſe, this He muſt be ſuppoſed to hold, that, this text forbids Church men all deliberat medling in Civil affaires. But will He dare to ſay that Samuel and Eli their judging of Iſrael was not *deliberat* and of *Choice*, Ergo, It was ſinfull by this rule; Yet he pleads

ads for its imitablenes as lawfull; though a deliberat involving themſelves in Civil government, yea a Supreme rule; and thus holds it not croſſ to this goſpell precept. So that to eſcape this *Scylla* or *Charybdis*, He hath no imaginable refuge but one; (viz.) To aſſert with us, their extraordinarie Calling for what they did, and that ſingular old Teſtament-diſpenſation under which they ſtood. But then He muſt quit his plea for prelats civil Imployments from this Inſtance, and confeſſe it to be inconcludent.

But for the new Teſtament times, he tells us. *How much Biſhops were employed in Civill affairs, when Emperours became Chriſtian, as Smectymnuus confeſſes.* But 1. Since he pretends Scripture Inſtances under the old Teſtament, his new Teſtament Inſtance is very *apochryphal and heterogeneus* thertunto, being of Biſhops medling three or four hundered years, after the Canon of the Scripture was cloſed. *Humano Capiti cervicem pingere equinam.* But his new Teſtament precept 2. Tim. 2. 4. Chaſed away the Inſtance of Biſhops medling in civill affaires, Three or four Hundred years forward. Nixt, I would know whither our *Informer* holds theſe Biſhops medling in Secular affairs, to be lawfull or unlawfull? If lawfull, and conſiſting with their Calling (which He would ſeem to inſinuat in telling us, that *Saravia defends at large*, (even ſimply and abſolutly) *Churchmens medling in ſtate affaires*) Why then doth he tell us in the nixt page *That the fathers compleaned of this as aburden*? Sure they were very froward to fret under a peece of lawfull imployment. If it was unlawfull, or *a deliberat ſinfull intanglement*, why obtruds he it upon us as a regular precedent? And what will *Smectymnuus* acknowledgment of the *factum* import, to inferr *His*, or *Our* acknowledgment of the *jus*. He tells us likwayes, *That ancient Councells [upon the ground mentioned, 2. Tim. 2. 4. of a Miniſters ſinfull intanglement] diſcharged them to follow Militarie imployments*

*ments, or to take ferms &c.* Hence I inferr, then theſe Councels held, that deliberat medling in ſtate affaires, or worldly incumberances, is inconſiſtent with a Miniſters calling, and a ſinfull intanglement diſcharged in that text; for ſince they diſcharged Militarie employments and ferms upon this ground, they doe conſequently diſcharge all ſuch *Intanglement.* For, *a quatenus, ad omne, &c.* This he cannot but grant. And from hence I infer, two things againſt him. 1. He ſetts theſe *Councils* by the eares with his *Scriptur inſtances.* For ſince they condemne theſe formentioned civil employments upon that ground, 2 Tim. 2: 4. As a ſinfull intanglement in a Church officer; he muſt either ſay, that they condemned theſe old - Teſtament Inſtances of the Prieſts, of Samuel and Eli, as ſinful: Or elſe acknowledge, that they held them (with us) to be extraordinary, and no regular precedents. 2. It will hence follow, that theſe Councils doe condemne *Saravia*, who (he tells us) *doth at ſome length defend Church mens acting in State affaires.* And *Saravia* condemnes and diſputs againſt theſe Councils; and then, it will be a puſling problem to him, to which of them he will adhere in this conteſt; ſince he holds, with theſe councels, upon that ground, 2 Tim. 2: v. 4. the unlawfulneſs of Miniſters deliberat involving themſelves in civil affaires, it ſeems be quites there great *Advocat Saravia*, and all his pleading upon this point; For he tells us of no *limitation* in *Saravia* his pleading for Miniſters meddling in State affaires. As for what followes in this page, he obſcures and ſhifts the point here inqueſtion, in ſaying, *That it is hard, to call it ſimply unlawful, and in every caſe, to medle in theſe things.* We know there is a lawful *Concional* medling, & alſo in way of *Miniſterial advice*, unto the Magiſtrat in order to the ſatisfaction of his conſcience, the Miniſterial direction whereof is the Paſtours work, at whoſe mouth Gods

mynd

mynd muſt be ſought, and likewayes by way of *miniſterial teſtimonie* againſt what is ſinful in ſtate Rulers, which is all that our principles do own as to Miniſters interpoſing in ſtate affaires in our late times; but he that cannot diſtinguiſh this, from *accuſtant official medling as a civil Judge, and conſtituent Member in civil Judicatories*, is very blinde; And as ſtupid that man were, who could not diſtinguiſh this from the privat *domeſtick care* mentioned, 1 Tim. 5:8. Which is a part of that *Eiconomie* founded uonp the Law of nature, and competent to a Miniſter as a Maſter of the Family, who is to govern and *rule his houſe* under that notion. Yet we muſt here tell him, that Gods allowing the Miniſter his *honorarium*, or *maintenance*, is for this very end, that he may not by any overſtretch of the domeſtick care, be taken off from his holy imployment.

Here, we ſhall offer to this *Informers* grave judgment, the Reaſons of the *Aſſembly* 1638. *Seſſ* 25. againſt the civil Offices of Miniſters. [1. Chriſts notable example Luk. 12: 14. Refuſing to deal in a civil cauſe; Miniſters are his Ambaſſadours ſent by him, as he was by the Father, Joh. 20: 21. Joh. 8. He would not ſentence that woman who deſerved death. 2. Civil Rule is diſcharged to Apoſtles, Matth. 20: v. 25, 26. not only Supreme which is competent to Princes, but ſubordinat alſo: Citing that paſſage of *Bernard to Eugenius, Lib* 2. *Apoſtolis interdicitur dominatus, ergo, tu tibi uſurpare aude, aut dominans, Apoſtolatum aut Apoſtolicus, dominatum Dominion is diſcharged to Apoſtles, Go thou thereſore and dare to uſurp to thy ſelf, whither the Apoſtleship, if holding a civil dominion, or being Apoſtolick a civil dominion.* Where they refute the ordinary Epiſcopal & Popiſh evaſion as to κυριευω & καταξκυριευω. 3. That Miniſters having given up their names to this holy warfare, they ought not to be involved in things of this life, as the law denyes this to ſouldiers. C. d. Lib: 2. Tit 13, So the Apoſtolick law, 2 Tim. 2:04.

This

This work to be heavier then that any man can be sufficient for it alone 2 Cor. 2: 16. Hence Ministers are called watchmen, labourers, souldiers, fishers, &c. 4. The Apostles, for all their extraordinarie gifts, were not fit for serving tables and preaching the word both, Act 6. although these were both *ecclesiastick functiones*; therefore farr lesse can any Minister now assume both ecclesiastick and civil offices. *Gregorie* the 1. (*cited by Gratian in Decreto dist*: 89 ——— *Cap. Singula.*) proves that two ecclesiastick offices are not to be committed to one, from that place of the Apostle Rom. 12: 6: 7. As it is unbeseeming that in mans bodie, one member should Act the part of another. The 6th. of the Canons called Apostolick, appoints that the Bishop or Presbyter assuming civil places, be deposed (which will make fearfull Massacre among our Prelats, that day the Parliament rides) so Can. 81: and 82. Cyprian. lib: 1, Epist. 9. sayes, that long before, It was appointed in a Councel of Bishopes, that none appoint in his Testament, one of the Clergie, a Tutor or Curator, *Quando singuli divino sacerdotio honorati, non nisi altari & sacrificiis, precibus & orationi vacare debent. Since every one honoured with the divine priesthood, ought not to attend but to the Altar and Sacrifices, to prayer and preaching, for its written, no man that warrs &c. Clemens* the 1. (whom many make Bishop of Rome, and out of whose writings, the defect of ecclesiastick history after the Actes of the Apostles, they affirme, must be made up) in the Epistle to James the brother of the Lord, whom they make a Bishop, hath these words, *neque judicem, aut cognitorem secularium negotiorum, te ordinare vult Christus, ne præfocatus presentibus hominum curis, non possis verbo Dei vacare, & secundum veritatis regulam, secernere bonos a malis. impietatis tibi crimen est, neglectis verbi Dei studiis, sollicitudines suscipere seculares.* That is, *neither will Christ ordaine thee a judge and arbiter of civill affaires, lest being involved in the*

*present*

*preſent cares of men, thou be not able to attend the word of God, and according to the rule of verity, to ſeparat the good from the evill; It blotts thee with the Crime of impietie to take* up ſecular cares, neglecting the Studjes of the word of God. *Syneſius*, Biſhop of Ptolemais, cited by *Lipſius in politicis*, ſaid, *that it is unlawfull to joyne the Civill power with the prieſthood - nam hoc eſſet miſcere non miſcenda. hoc eſt Sacris civilia confundere. For this were to mix together things which cannot be mixed, that is, to confound Civill maters with Sacred.* See ſeverall others cited by the aſſembly, and recorded in the *Hiſtoria motuum*, pag. 283, 284. Where there is ane Anſwer to the objection drawen from *Auguſtins* practiſe, and from that of 1. Cor. 6. 4.

The informer comes nixt (page 5.) to his defence of the *Epiſcopall office it ſelf*, But ſtill goes on in the miſt of confuſed generalls, never condeſcending upon the nature, power, and extent of the dioceſian Biſhopes office, as it is now eſtabliſhed by law. However, let us remember that our preſent prelat is, according to our law [ Ane ordinary Church officer, aſſuming the government of ſome Hundereds of Congregations, as monopolized in him, and conveyed according to his pleaſur, unto the Miniſters therof; Having ſole power in ordination, and juriſdiction, and a negative voice in Church judicatories, & whoſe proper worke is *Ruleing only*, not feeding by doctrine ] This is the Biſhop which all his pleading muſt be commenſurat unto, elſe He but beats the Air. 1. The *Doubter* alleages [ The unlawfullnes of the Epiſcopall office for want of ane expreſſe warrand for it in the word] To which He anſwers [ *By granting that this will prove it to be not ſimply neceſſare, but not unlawfull, ſince it may be lawfull and expedient as falling under ſome generall; as the command of decencie and order, will warrand a Moderator and Clerke, although this be no where commanded. That many learned men have thought prelacie lawfull, though not commanded, nor warranted by any particu-*

*lar Scripture precedent, nor yet prohibited, but left to Christian prudence as it is found expedient and conduceing to the good of the Church.*] To which I answer. 1. He grosly misstaks the Import of these relatives, *a command*, and the *necessitie* of a thing flowing therefrom, when restricting it to ane *expresse warrand* or command: there being many things necessarie, *necessitate precepti*, which have no expresse warrand or command. Divines doe tell us, that Scripture commands are either *immediat*, or *mediat*; the immediat, are either *explicit*, or in expresse terms, enjoyning a thing: as [honour thy father and thy mother] or *implicit*, holding out, either that which is comprehended in the command, as suetable midses leading to the dueties enjoyned, or deduced by consequence from what is expressed; As Ministers preaching is deduced by consequence from the command thereanent which the Apostles got: the Circumstances of the command pointing out this to be a perpetuall duetie of Church officers. Againe 2. There are *divine commands* which are *mediat*, comming mediatly from God, but immediatly from men, by a determination of the generall divine principle, and ane application therof to particulares: which they illustrat by that passage where Paul sayes, *to the rest speak I, not the Lord*, applying Gods generall command anent divorce, to the Corinthians particular case. There are likewise [mediat accidental commands,] deduced from Gods generall Rule, upon rare transient occasiones, yet necessitating to such a determination: So the abstaining from blood and thinges strangled, was enjoyned (Act. 15.) to the gentiles, and as necessarie upon the ground of Charitie when the use grew scandalus, although the law hereanent was abrogat, as being originallie Ceremoniall. Hence we may Inferr, that this Informer in denying *the necessitie* of what is commanded only *under some generall head*, Cutts of from the Categorie of things

things neceſſarie, all the duties in the decalogue, which are ſubſerviant to the duties *expreſſly named*: and thus deſtroyes the Spirituality and extent of the law, acknowledged by all divines; yea Cuts off all neceſſarie Scripture conſequences, and duties founded therupon: as Miniſters preaching the goſpell, adminiſtring the Seales, Infant baptiſm, womens receaving the Sacrament, the Chriſtian Sabbath &c. But (to come neerer him) in the Nixt place, I ſuppoſe this man will not deny, That there are many things ſufficiently diſcharged, and conſequently unlawfull by Scripture rule, becauſe theyare not commanded either mediatly or immediatly, and that all ordinances of worſhip, Sacraments, and the ſubſtantialls of government alſo, doe require *clear divine commands and inſtitutions*, by the acknowledgement of all proteſtant divines; So that the not commanding of any part or ſuppoſed ingredient therof, is a ſufficient diſcharge, diſcovering the thing ſuperadded to be ſinfull. Not that which ſeems good unto thee, ſhalt thoudoe to the Lord thy God but what He hath commanded, thou ſhalt add nothing thereunto, nor diminiſh from it. adde thou not to his words leſt He reprove thee, and thou be found a liar. In vaine they doe worſhip me teaching for doctrines the commandements of men. See, deut. 4. 2. prov: 30. 6. rev: 22. 18. deut: 12. 32. Iſay. 29: 13. Theſe Scriptures do clearly fortifie this principle: Otherwayes if he deny this, He will open a door to all popiſh ſuperſtition, yea & deny the very definition of it aſſigned by all ſound divines, in calling it, *ane oppoſite extrem (in the exceſs) to true religion, adding to Gods worſhip beyonde what is commanded.* Our Lord reprehended the phariſees their waſhing of hands befor dinner (a decent ceremonie in it ſelf) as ſimply unlawfull, when they made it a point of Religion, Becauſe it was *beyond the command.* That text Iſay. 29: 13. In vaine they worſhip me, teaching for

doctrines the commandements of men] is applyed in this case unto them. Our answer to the Papists demand [Where finde we their bastard Sacraments, and other Superstitiones discharged] is, That they are discharged as sinfull in Gods worship, because not commanded: Should they rejoyne with this man, that this will prove them to be not simpy necessarie, but not unlawfull, upon the ground which He alleages, let him conjectur what his answer would be, and correct himself. For the substantials of government, He cannot but grant that they fall under the same consideration; It being most certain, and universally acknowleged, that the Scripture layes down rules as to the excercise of both Keyes of Order and jurisdiction, the officers and censures of the Church. Nay, himself asserts page. 118. *That the substantials of government and policie of the Church are utterly necessarie and unalterable.* Now it being thus, the Question is [whither the diocesian Bishop, or Episcopal government, be among those things which must either have a clear Scripture institution or warrand, or else is to be rejected as sinfull and unlawfull] That the diocesian Bishop is such, I prove it thus: the Bishop which He pleads for, is supposed by him to be a Church officer distinct from, and Superior to a Pastour or presbyter, haveing a distinct worke, ordination, and qualifications; Therfore, say I, Hee must either have clear warrand or institution in the word, or Hee is unlawfull. The consequence leans upon these clear Scripture grounds. 1. This officer cannot but fall in among *the substantials of government*, wherin the Scripture is full and perfect (as himself acknowleges) So as to make even the man of God, perfect: It is full in setting down all administrations relating so the Key of order, as prayer and thanksgiveing, 1. Tim. 2. 1, 2. 1. Cor. 14. 14, 15. Singing of Psalmes, preaching of the word, publick reading of it, and Cathechiseing,

falls

falls within the compasse of Christs commands and regulations, Colloſ. 3. 16. 1. Cor. 14. 15, 16. Epheſ. 5. 19. 2. Cor. 3. 14. Matth. 28. 19, 20. 2. Tim. 4. 2. Hebr. 6. 1, 2. So doth the adminiſtration of Sacraments, Baptiſme and the Lords Supper, Matth. 28. 18, 19. 1. Cor. 11. 23. And as theſe adminiſtrations of *the Key of Order*, ſo all the adminiſtrations relating *to the Key of juriſdiction or diſcipline*, falls under Christs clear inſtitutions. Such as Ordination. Tit. 1. 5. 1. Tim. 4. 14. *The dogmatick power*, as to Miniſteriall judgeing of doctrine. Act. 15. *The critick power*, as to the publick rebuke and purging out of the Scandalous, and receaving of the penitent. Matth. 18. 15, 16. 1. Theſſ. 5. 14. Compared with Matth. 16. 19. John. 20. 21. So *the diatactick power*, in relation to Rituals and and alterable Circumſtances, is clearly aſſerted and rules laid downe anent its exerciſe 1 Cor. 14. And as the adminiſtrations, ordinances, and acts of Church government, So the *adminiſtratores, officers, yea and Courtes* falls under clear Scripture warrands and inſtitutiones. Paſtoures, Doctores, Elders, Deacons, their ſeverall works, the greater and leſſer Church judicatories, have their clear warrand, 1. Tim. 4. 14. Matth. 18. 17. Act. 15. 1. Cor. 12. 28. Epheſ. 4. Now let this *Informer* ſhew me a reaſone of this diſtinctnes, If not to point out all the ſubſtantialls of government? and if it be lawfull to add any *new officers, or adminiſtrations, or ordinances, to theſe expreſſly warranted*? He dare not ſay but is unlawfull; therfore ſay I, upon the ſame ground, that hee ſhall acknowledge this to be unlawfull, this eminent officer, the Biſhop or Arch-Biſhop, muſt either produce his warrand and inſtitution, among the forementioned Rules, or he muſt be holden unlawfull. 2. The Scripture coming this length in the forementioned condeſcendencie in point of Church government, as to Ordinances, Officers, Lawes, Cenſures, Courtes &c, it muſt needs amount

to determin *Some ſpecies of government*, and presbitery, and Epiſcopacie, being of contrary moulds, It muſt needs appointe and authorize the One, and diſcharge the other. For all Church offices and officers have a poſitive inſtitution. 1. Cor. 12. 28. *God hath ſett &c.* Epheſ. 4. 11. *God hath given &c.* Rom. 12. 6, 7. The office *not given* is not *a gift of grace.* And ſurely the command [not to add to the word] includes a command not to add new ſpirituall officers, who muſt have a new work &c. And the Biſhops authority muſt either be comprehended among the rules anent theſe officers enumerat, and the exerciſe of their power, or he is ane *apocriphal* offieer and unlawfull: Or he muſt ſay we may add new officers, and offices, and inſtitutions in poynt of government, to theſe contained in Scripture; and ſo our divines argument againſt the pope, from the Scriptures ſilence anent him, in its enumeration of officers, is naught. 3. Chriſt exerciſing ane external *viſible kingdom* over his Church viſible, and all Church officers, and their adminiſtrations, being *in his name and authoritie* as is above cleared, *every Church officers miſſion and warrand* muſt be found in his word, other wayes he runs unſent, and cannot expect his bleſſing; all that come befor him, and anticipat his call, are theeves and robbers. 4. All Chriſts officers, and their gifts *are Chriſts royall and mediatorie donations to his Church*, and by him peculiarly *ſet and authorized* therein. Epheſ. 4. 6, 7, 8. &c, 1. Cor. 12. 28. He, as the great Maſter of the houſe, gives all his Stewards their Keys, their Orders; Now, how Chriſt the king and head of his Church, *his donation, his commiſſion, his giving his Keyes*, Should be inſtructed other wayes, then by his *clear warrands and inſtitutiones in his word and Teſtament*, I would gladly learne of this *Informer.* Is there any officer of State, any ſubordinat Magiſtrat allowed in a kingdome, which hath not the clear warrand of the lawes? Surely not, and ſo the

caſe

caſe is here. *Finallie.* The ground and reaſone which he builds this ſhifting evaſion upon [viz. That many things are not otherwayes commanded, then under ſome generall: as that all things be done decently or to edification, inſtancing in the moderator and Clerk of a meeting of Miniſters] is very poor? For ſince the authority which God gave Paul was *to edification*, & all ordinances which have the moſt clear inſtitution, muſt be thus qualified, and to this end, that which is not *Otherwayes commanded then under this generall*, muſt needs be the *alterable circumſtances only*, commone to Civill and Sacred actions, and ſuch as ſuppoſes the thing it ſelf, cloathed with theſe circumſtances, to be [*that which is to be done*,] and by conſequence falling *Hactenus* under the Compaſſe of a *command* or *inſtitution*; for it is theſe only which are left to the regulation of Chriſtian prudence, according to the generall rules of the word. But, as we have above cleared, ſuch ane eminent Church officer as the Biſhop is ſuppoſed to be, or any Church officer, can be no ſuch circumſtance, but is ſuch a ſubſtantiall point of government as requires a clear and poſitive warrand, or elſe muſt be holden unlawfull; and this he muſt acknowledge or contradict himſelf, for He dare not ſay but that Church officers are other wayes commanded then under this generall, and himſelf alledges the prelats divine inſtitution: & ſo He can be none of theſe things which hath only this generall warrand. Beſides, I would know, if He will ſay that this officer, the prelat, muſt be ſett up and Act with decencie and order; ſurely He will not deny this: If then the prelat himſelf is but a peece of [decentie, and order] (as being only commanded under that notion, and a ſpecies under that generall) then he ſayes that [order and decencie] muſt be managed & cloathed with [order and decencie] which will be very hard to reconceale to ſenſe; or He muſt ſay, that the prelat muſt act with diſor-

der and confuſion, or (to evit theſe rockes) that the prelat muſt be warranted under another notion then that of a circumſtance of meer order, and ſo muſt have a particular warrand. His inſtance of the Moderator and Clerk is very fooliſh, the Clerk not being neceſſarly [a Church officer] and the Moderator [no diſtinct Church officer] from the reſt of the members, and ſo is utterly Impertinent to this pointe and queſtion, anent *a Church officer diſtinct from and Superior to a presbiter*, whither he ought to have a particular Scripture warrand. Beſides that the ſame divine warrand that a judiciall procedor by diſquiſition, votes, and ſuffrage hath, and is exemplified in that Synod Act. 15. (this being the neceſſary frame of judicatories, as ſuch, and conſequently of all Church judicatories) the moderator hath the ſame foundation of his office; but He will never let us ſee a ſhaddow of this for the prelat. Now to ſhew what good Harmonie this Informer keeps in this point with ſome chieff men of his way (& others alſo) let us hear what they hold, *Inſtitutum Apoſtolorum de regimine Eccleſiaſtico —— & ea gubernationis ratio quæ ætate Apoſtolorum fuit &c. —— The Apoſtles appointment as to Church government, and that way and method of government which was in their time, is perpetuall, and can no more be changed then the prieſthood of Aaron could*, ſaith Saravia *contra bezam Whitaker controv. 4. Queſt: 1. Cap. 9. Tells us, That the Church muſt not be governed vt humano ingenio arriſerit, as pleaſes mens fancie, ſed ut Chriſto Eccleſiæ domino ſolique principi placet, But as it pleaſes Chriſt her only head and Lord. Hence he concludes that the forme which He hath inſtitut muſt be held faſt as the beſt. Matth: Sutliv: de Pontif: Roman: lib. 1 Cap 1. Anſwering Bellarmins argument from Civil to Eccleſiaſtick Monarchie, tells him that ſicut unus Eccleſiæ ſummus princeps &c As there is one chieff Prince of the Church, ſo there is one true eſſential forme therof, differing from the various moulds of commone wealthes; & that as she hath but one*

heade

*head, ſo but one frame of policie, which thoſe who reſyle from Chriſti leges tranſgrediuntur - they tranſgreſs the lawes of Chriſt, and blotts her true government. Field, of the Church, lib: 5. Cap: 45. Argues thus againſt the popes temporal power, that among men non hath power of chaingeing any thing but he alone to whom in an eminent degree it belongs, and from whom it is originally derived*; but to govern the Church as ſuch is not eminently in the Magiſtrat.] It is a Bad o' men, *ceſpitare in limine*; our informer we ſee, in his firſt anſwer to his doupter, is ſo unhappie, as therin to juſtle with ſoom chieff champions of his cauſe.

## Chap. IX.

*The Informer undertakes to anſwer the Arguments of Presbyterians againſt Epiſcopacy. His anſwers to our Argumets from Matth. 20: 25, 26. and 1 Petr. 5: 3. Examined at large. The genuine ſtrength and nerves of our reaſoning upon theſe Texts, which he dare not medle with. His anſwers found inconſiſtent with themſelves, the ſame with Papiſts anſwers for the papacie, and contrare to the ſenſe of ſound divines.*

THe *doubter* in the nixt place [alleages Prelacy to the forbidden, and therefore unlawful: bringing for proof Matth. 20: 25, 26, 27, 28. And the Argument from this text, he makes his poor doubter ſienderly and curtly to repreſent thus, *That Chriſt forbids any of his diſciples to be greater then another.* This paſſage with its parallel Luk. 22: 25. Is much ſcanned betwixt the Papiſts and us, in relation to the *popes Dominion*, and as it ſtriks

clearly againſt Prelacy, ſo Papiſts and Prelats doe as clearly joyne iſſue in their anſwers. In both paſſages it is apparent, that upon occaſion of a ſinfull and ambitious emulation among the Diſciples, which of them ſhould be greateſt, our Lord did ſharpely reprehend them, diſchargeing them expreſly the Lordly grandour of Earthly Rulers or Princes, and to exerciſe Lordſhipe or Dominion over one another, commending inſtead thereof, and in oppoſition thereto, a *humble Miniſterial ſervice*, and ſpiritual diligence in their ſpiritual ſtewardſhip or Miniſtery, preſſing both, from his own exemplary humility in his converſe with them. Now, our Argument againſt Prelacy is very ſtrong from this text, and hath theſe *Nerves*. 1. The Lord moſt expreſly diſcharges Superiority and inferiority among officers *of the ſame kinde*: Non are greater then another in their office; no Apoſtle above another; but a compleat parity in their *official power* is here holden out; *ergo*, by neceſſary conſequence, he commands a parity among Paſtoures, and diſcharges ſuperior and inferior *degrees* among them. 2. Whatever priority of order among officers of different kindes, be allowed, yet he diſcharges *Dominion* or *principalitie* in any of them, *all maſterly power*, ſuch as is allowed in civil Government; there being but *one Maſter* or *Lord* over the Church, and all Miniſters being Brethren. This is clear, in that he mentions the civil Lordſhipe of Rulers who are called *benefactors* in exemplyfiing what he diſcharges them, and likewayes in oppoſition therunto, commends a *humble Miniſterial ſervice*, not a ſort of warrantable Dominion, as that parallel 1 Pet. 5: 3. Makes it evident; So that he gives two deadly blowes here to the Dioceſian Lord Prelat. 1. In that he makes himſelf a *higher order and degree* of the Paſtorall office, whereas the Lord diſcharges this among officers of the *ſame kinde*. 2. In Lording it over his brethren (other Paſtoures) both

in

in a pretended ſpiritual capacitie, arrogating to himſelf a ſole power in ordination and juriſdiction, and a maſterly power and principality over Church judicatories, (as is cleared above) and likewayes in his aſſumeing the Earthly Lordſhip, place and grandoure, of civil Magiſtrates, which is here expreſly diſcharged. This being premiſed, let us hear what this new Advocat ſayes to this Text. 1. He tels us that [ It is a great miſtake to think, that all ſuperiority among Church men is here forbidden, which he fortifies 1. With this Reaſon, that the twelve, though equall among themſelves, yet were ſuperior to the ſeventy Diſciples who were alſo ſent to preach, & this He proves, becauſe Matthias who was choſen to ſucceed Judas in the Apoſtleſhip, was one of them.] Anſ. 1. It is here convincingly apparent, that this man ſhiftes, but dare not grapple with this Scripture, and the argument drawn from it, while he ſhuffles in this gloſſe and miſtake (which is his own, not oures) viz, *that all ſuperioritie is here diſcharged among Church men*, as our inference or medium againſt prelacie from this text, as is evident from what is ſaid. We grant with all ſound divines, that among Church men or Church officers, there are ſuperior and inferior degrees. Firſt Apoſtles, ſecondarly Prophets &c. But we ſay, that hereby ſuperiority among theſe of the *ſame degree* is forbidden, and likwayes *principalitie and lordſhip* in any of them of whatever order or degree, over another. So that we are not concerned to enquire, whither the Apoſtles were Superior to the ſeventy Diſciples, or whither they were ſent to preach, and not rather (as ſome doe judge) intruſted with a tranſient miſſion to prepare our Lords acceſs to thoſe places whither he was to come, with out any formall Miniſteral miſſion above ordinarie Diſciples. Only I muſt ſay, his proofe of this Superiority of the Twelve above the Seventie, is very odd (viz.) *Matthias was choſen ane Apoſtle, though one of the Sevintie.* Now, to give Scripture

light

light and proofe of this topick, both branches of this assertion must be proved from Scripture, not only that Matthias was chosen in Judas roome, but also and mainely, *that he was one of the Seventie*, wherof the Scripture is utterly silent: and instead of Scripture proof of this, wee must take *Clemens* and *Dorotheus*, their *Saidso*, which maks up a *heterogenious* proofe, like the feet and toes made of iron and clay. 2. He tells us, *That ambition, and not inequality, is here discharged.* This ane old shift of *Bellarm:* and the Papists, we say that both ambition, the root and principle of this desire, and the thing it self which was the *object* of this *ambitious desire* (viz.) Dominion, Principality, and Lordship one over another, is here forbidden: *Subordinata non pugnant.* 't is strang sottishnes in this man to imagin, that ambition, the inward principle of this unlawful primacie or inequalitie, should be forbidden onely, and not the inequalitie or primacie it self, the outward act and accomplishment of this ambition. *Bellarm:* answer to our divines argument against the popes Supremacie from the text, is, *that dominion is not here discharged, but rather supposed, and that it is only such ane ambitious lust of overruling as is among the Kings of the Gentiles*, that is forbidden. *Whittaker* (de Pontif: Cap: 1.) Answers him, *that this dominion it self, not the ambitious affectation only, is discharged. Bernard* writing to *Eugenius*, & expounding this passage, & that of 1. Pet. 5. Understands them both as striking against dominion, and enjoyning a Ministeriall care in opposition therunto, *Dominion* (saith hee) *is discharged and Ministery is enjoyned*, So at length he concludes after severall things to this purpose. *Thus Bernard clearly teaches* (saith *Whittak:* de Pontif: Quest: 1.) *that humilitie is not required in dominion* (as our Informer distinguishes with *Bellarm:*) *but dominion it self is discharged. But Bellarmin admitts to play the Lords if they be modest and humble in their dominion. Christus de re ipsa &c.* (saith *Iunius*, de pontif: lib: 1.) *Christ said of the thing it self, they exercise dominion*

but

*but he spake not of the maner, they exercise dominion after this or that maner; they exercise dominion, saith he, but not so yee that is, yees hall not exercise dominion: it is a plaine denyal of the thing proposed.* So we see his shift here as to prelacie, is the same with that of the Papists in defending the papacie. But his Reason of this his glosse must be considered, [viz.] *Because otherwayes, our Lords argument taken from his own example* v. 28. *Would not suite his purpose, since he was in power and authoritie above the Twelve. Ans:* (Not to stay here to tell him, that this defence and glosse will equally serve the popes turne, and bear the blow of this text off his head in Correspondance with *Bellarmins* Notion above touched) Our Lords scope in proposeing his own example, is to antidot their inward pride, the root of their desire of this dominion, and powerfully to commend to them humility and lowlines, as the most excellent remedy therof: And his argument runns *a fortiori* thus. If I your Lord and Master be as on that serves, and am such a pattern of selfdenial and humility among you, much more ought you to studie humility, and to guard against all usurped authority and dominion, over on another, who are fellow Disciples, and servants. So he reasoned Joh 13. If I your Lord & master have washed your feet, you [viz, much more as being equalls] ought also to wash one anothers feet; so that which he imagines doth mak Christs argument not sute well, maks it the more forcible & suite the better. 2. He here contradicts himself, while making the argument from Christs example, v. 28. to suite the discharge of ambition only, not of inequality (the terms in which he impertinently states the difference and opposition, as to what is discharged and not discharged) for he grants there was to be no inequalitie among the Apostles; and when he thus limites his general answer [that *all superioritie* among Church men is not here discharged] he grants that *some superioritie* (viz) among the Apostles themselves, was discharged, and consequently

ly discharged upon this motive *Christs own example*. How then, I pray, will he make this argument from Christs example, who was in dominion and principality above the Twelve, and their, and all the Churches monarch and head, suite his purpose of discharging Inequality, Superioritie, or primacie among the Apostles? His reason he explaines, thus further; *that taking Christ onely to speak against ambition, or a sinful desire of superoritie, which was Diotrephes fault, the reason from his own example suites well who, though above all, yet was, a pattern to all in humility.* Ans. 1. Wee have heard that Christs argument suites best in the sense we have propounded, which is the sense of all sound divines. 2. If it was only a sinful desire of a superioritie in it self lawful, such as he sayes Diotrephes had (how rationally we shall after see) which our Lord dehorted from by his own example, then all our divines have mist the marke in pleading from this text against the object of this desire, not the sinful maner of desiring only, and the Papists gloss holds good against them, viz: that Christs example will plead only against ambition. 3. Our *Informer* yet againe falleth here into a twofold contradiction. 1. He makes the Superiority, the object of this ambitious desire, to be in it selflawful, and their fault only to lie in the ambitious or sinful desire; yet in answer to the nixt objection he grants, that Christ discharged *dominium civile & despoticum*; Now, he must either say, that this was the object of their desire, & consequently that it was sinful in the object, or else that our Lords discourse and exhortation was not to the purpose; Againe, this *domineum civile & despoticum*, is more then a meer superioritie. But 2. the superioritie here discharged was *among the Apostles themselves*, & this was the object of their desire; the ambitious question and debate was, *which of them should be greatest*, and highest above all the rest? Now he grants that there was to be *no superioritie*

*rioritie*, far leſs *principality* among them; How then can he ſay that Chriſt diſcharged only ane ambitious affectation of *a ſuperioritie in it ſelf lawful*; ſuch as *Dictrephes* had, whom we will find him after aſſert to have endeavoured to put himſelf into a lawful pre-exiſtent office. Surely if there was to be no inequality among them, their deſire of inequality was moſt *ſinful in the object*, upon that very ground. Againe, he grants that Chriſt ſpeaks to the Twelve, and likwayes cannot deny, but clearly inſinuates a conceſſion with the text, that the Apoſtles were ſtriveing about *inequality*, which he acknowledges was *unlawful in them*, yet in the ſecond anſwer, he will not have this diſcharged; which how inconſiſtent it is, let any judge. Beſide, ſince Chriſt ſpoke this to the twelve, among whom there was to be [no inequality in reſpect of power] as he ſayes, & conſequently diſcharged this, ſince he is rebuking them for ſtriving about a *primacy*, the higheſt degree of inequality in reſpect of power, how abſurd & nonſenſical is his 2d anſwer, which denies [that Chriſt diſcharged inequality;] could Chriſt diſcharge them an inequality of the higheſt pitch, and yet not diſcharge inequality? Or could [all inequality in reſpect of power] be unlawful among them, and yet not be diſcharged when our Lord diſcharged [a primacy of power?] he will prove a ſtrang critick if he diſtinguiſh theſe. He tells us *laſtly* here *that humility & imparity can well conſiſt*. But can humility, & a *forbidden imparity* conſiſt? can humility in a Churchman, & [Dominium civile and deſpoticum] conſiſt? Both which he acknowledges were diſcharged to the Apoſtles here. So he inſinuats that their deſired imparity, was ſtill lawful in it ſelf, ſince it may be poſſeſſed even *humbly*, & thus heaps up inconſiſtencies. He objects to himſelf *That Chriſt in denying to them, the Dominion of the Princes of the gentiles, diſcharged all ſuperiority among Church men. To which* he anſwers *That he onely diſcharges* [*Dominium civile, & deſpoticum*] *a princely Lordly power, ſuch as they exerciſe: but the power of the Church is of another nature. Anſ.* 1. [Not to meedle with his

makeing

makeing *Dominium civile*, and *despoticum*, *adequat termes*, there being a *Dominium politicum*, ordinarely contradistinguished from *despoticum*, which is also a *Dominium civile*) He grants here, that it was more then a simple desire of a lawful superiority, which the *Apostles* were tainted with, forgeting what he said immediatly before. *Nixt*, if Christ discharged this *civil Lordly power* to Churchmen, he discharged them to be *Parliaments Lords*, and to hold civil state offices, contrare to what he pleades from the instances of the Priests Numb. 11. and from *Eli* & *Samuel*; and so he must grant the new Testament Church and its dispensation, to be in this different from the old, since he acknowledges that *Church power* was here allowed the Apostles and their successors, and *civill power* discharged. Thus our *Informer* must grant, that Christ did here rid marches betwixt these things which he before confounded, and their Erastian Prelacy confounds. Again, this is the very shift of Bellarmin to save the popes supremacie: *The Lord*, saith he, *In forbidding them, to rule as the Princes of the Gentiles, signified they were to rule, but not after that manner* [viz.] Ecclesiastically; So he thinks it touches not the popes Ecclesiastick supremacy, and the *Informer* in this stryks hands with him. For if our Lord discharged only here *that kind of Dominion* as he sayes; But allowed a Church power or dominion of another nature, surely for any thing that is here discharged, ane Ecclesiastick pop or patriarch his mytre stands sure, and is never touched by any prohibition which the Disciples here got, against the sense and pleading of all Protestants. Moreover, will this *Informer* adventur to say that *the popes primacy*, or *ecclesiastick Monarchy*, even as abstracted from his civill Dominion, is not here discharged; And if it be [as all our divines assert it is] then our Lord understood another sort of abuse of power then invadeing a *Dominium civile*, even all despotick or Lordly power, whither

whither civill, or pretended eccleſiaſtick in Church officers. Beſids, if he diſcharged Lordly power, he diſcharged that which Peter diſcharged 1 Pet. 5. Even to Lord over Gods heritage. What? will he dare to ſay that it is only a *civill Lordship* which is there diſcharged & not rather ane eccleſiaſtick dominion, Which hath *Gods heritage or Church* for its object: And if ſo, then the Prelats Dominion is expreſly ſtricken againſt, ſince (as we have above cleared) his power is a meer deſpotick Lordſhip or rule; For to be the proper object & fountaine of all eccleſiaſtick authority in the Dioceſs, to have ſole power in ordination & juriſdiction; the ſole deciſive ſuffrage in Judicatories, is either *a deſpotick Dominion and Lordship* or it is nothing; and if the Churches power is *of another nature then this* civill Dominion, as this man tells us, of what nature is it? Only of another nature, becauſe it touches *ſpiritual objects*; Then for any thing that is here forbidden, a papall eccleſiaſtick monarchy is never touched. Or is it of another nature becauſe in it ſelf *Steward-like and Miniſterial*, not deſpotick or Princely, like that of the Magiſtrat (which is the ſenſe of all ſound divines, and muſt be his too, if he ſpeak ſenſe) then who ſees not that the power of the Prince-or Lord-Prelat is moſt formally diſcharged? It being evidently of this nature. Yet againe, it is in this apparent that he ſhiftes and ſhuffles the queſtion, and its terms here, anent the power of the Prelat and the power diſcharged in this text. For in ſaying in the beginning of his Anſwer, that Chriſt diſcharges *that kind Dominion of onely* which civil Princes exerciſe, he muſt needes be ſuppoſed to contradiſtinguſh from this, *ane eccleſiaſtick Dominion* which is allowed, yet when he ſpeaks of this he alters the terms, telling us [that the *Churches power* is of another nature] he ſhould have ſaid the Churches *reſerved Dominion*, if he had ſpoken conſequently, as that *other kind* of Dominion which he allowes,

and by the conſequence of his diſcourſe, holds that the Text will allow; In a word, that all ſort of [Dominion] whither pretended eccleſiaſtick, or civil, is here diſcharged to Church officers, and conſequently his offering violence to the Text, is apparent from the context two wayes. 1. In that the ſtrife among the Apoſtles, flowing from this deſire of unlawful greatnes, and which drew forth this exhortation and prohibition under debate, was not about a civill deſpotick rule; *properly, or onely*, but anent a Lordſhip & chief rule *in the Church, and in matters eccleſiaſtick*, under Chriſt as their head; So that though the Lord exemplified the greatnes which he diſcharged them, in that of earthly princes, (there being no other then exiſtent and apparent) yet it was not this primarily, but *ane eccleſiaſtick Lordſhip* or dominion, which he ſtrycks againſt; Since he is directing them both negatively and poſitively anent the nature, And exerciſe of their ſpiritual and eccleſiaſtick Authority and Rule. 2. The poſitive parte of his injunction touching *a Miniſterial ſervice*, or *humble Miniſtery*, excludes all ſort of dominion in what ever ſenſe it can be taken, and not a civill dominion onely. Our *Informer* tells us, *nixt. That ſundrie interpreters, interpret Chriſts words, as diſcharging only Tyranny, ſuch as earthly Princes exerciſe.* And in this he Informers us right; Onely he ſhould have been ſo ingenuus as to tell us that they are interpreters beyond our line, that is popiſh interpreters, for this is directly *Bellarmins* ſhift, to which, ſince he ſtands here upon the ſame ground with him, I ſhall return learned *Whittakers* interpretation and anſwer, which hitherto I believe hath paſſed current with all ſound Proteſtants. *Chriſt ſets before them the example of the Kings of the Gentiles, not to the end they may flie ambition envy* (as this man ſhifts it) *but to let them underſtand that they have nothing to doe with a kingly rule.* —— *For* (ſaith he) *though the words tranſlated* [*exerciſe dominion or authority*]

*rity* ] *which Matthew maks uſe of, doeth ſometimes ſignifie immoderat dominion, yet Luke Omitts the prepoſition in both theſe Words: But ſo it is that the ſimple verb, is attribut to theſe who obtaine power and dominion, not to theſe who inſolently and tyrannically overerule; for all thoſe who among the gentiles obtained principality did not reigne tyrannically or unjuſtly, nay the Clemency of many ſuch, and their juſtice is praiſed.* Thus he, de pontif: Queſt: 1. To which I may add, that our Lord ſpeakes of ſuch Princes as were called Benefactoers or *graeious Lords*, a very unſuiteable deſignation for Tyrannes.

How eaſie is it from the *Informer* reaſoning here, and with his net to fiſh out a *papacy*. That which the Apoſtles here deſired was in it ſelf lawful, and the fault was onely in the ambitious deſire, as it was with diotrephes who deſired a lawful preexiſtent office: This he clearly aſſerts: I ſubſum: But that which they deſired, and were ſtriving about, was a primacie or papacie, Ergo that office is lawfull in it ſelf. The pope will thank our *Informer* for this.

The nixt text objected by *the doubter*, is that pregnant paſſage 1 Pet. 5: 3. *Be not Lords over Gods heritage.* And from this he maks him mutter out this ſlender argument, [is not ſuperiority among Church men there clearly forbidden.] Stiſl we ſee our *Informer* keeps him under the covert of his own groundleſs ſuppoſition, that we doe from this and ſuch like texts Impugne, *Superiority among Church men*, as he terms it, whereas wee allow (as he cannot but know) with all ſound divines, and ſcripture it ſelf, ſuperiour and inferiour degrees among Church officers: And he cannot ſhew that any Presbyterian did ever draw forth from this text ſuch ane inſignificant notion as this againſt Prelacy; But hee behoved to make the knot eaſy, ſince himſelf muſt looſe it. Our Argument from this text, is this, That the Apoſtle here injoyneing Miniſters their duty [both negatiyle

tivil and positively, he first dehorts from evills they are lyable unto, such as heart reluctancy at their laborius employment, covetusnes and usurpation or Lordship and Dominion, whither over their fellowes, which *Dietrephes* affected, or over the people, by taking ane arbitrarie masterly imperious way with them, or a way of force and rigoure, as these reptehended Ezek. 34: 4. He nixt, positively exhortes them to lead or rule in a holy exemplarie, Shepherd-like Method, expressing the word of grace in their practise. Now [I say) from this genuine sense and scope of the place, wee argue againstPrelacie, thus. 1. The Apostle exhorts these elders or Ministers as their [fellow-elder] supposeing them his immediat Successors in the *higheſt Spheere of ane ordinarie Miniſtery*, for he supposes them to have non higher over them now when he was shortly to put off his Tabernacle. 2. He enjoyns them *to feed and take the overſight, or exerciſe Epiſcopal authoritie* over the flock, as Paul did likewayes the Presbyters or elders of Ephesus, in his last farewel. (Act. 20.) a scrybing *a compleat Epiſcopal authoritie* to them, both as to jurisdiction and ordination. 3. Yet he discharges any of them to Lord it over Gods heritage, commending instead thereof, ane exemplarie humble service or ministery, Hence wee inferr againit the Diocesian Prelat. 1 That there is no higher officer then a Presbyter, left by the Apostles as their ordinary Successor, since the Apostle as their followPresbiter, exhorts themas the higheſt ordinary officers, and therfor the Prelat, pretending to be ane higher ordinary officer, is Apocriphal. 2. All Episcopall authority is in Presbyters, both as to ordination and Jurisdiction, and they have both name and thing of a *Scripture Bishop*, and therefore the Prelat, arrogating this name solely to himself, & all the Episcopal power of ordinationand Jurisdiction as his solely; and denying it to Presbyters, is ane Anti-scripturall Monster:

Monſter: Since theſe Presbyters had this in a *compleat parity* 3. Non of theſe Elders muſt exerciſe *a maſterly power and dominion over the flocks*, therefore the Lord Prelats imperious *Lordly power* is palpably condemned, which he exerciſes over *both Paſtores and flocks*. Now, this being our argument from this text, let any man judge of this *Informer* ingenuity, while repreſenting it in ſuch a diſguiſe, that he may ſeem able to grapple with it; Whereas we ſhall find that his anſwers to his Argument preſented thus in its genuine ſtrength, are like the conflict betwixt the giant and pigmee. But what ſayes he to the Argument as in his own mould. 1. He anſwers *That ſuperiority among Churchmen is not diſcharged.* By [Churchmen] if he underſtand in General, [Church officers] (though the terme be ſome what odd) we ſhall eaſily Admitt that this Text diſcharges not ſuperior and inferior degrees among them, but this will nothing help his cauſe, as is evident. If he mean ſuperiority among *preaching Preſbyters*, or Elders, we have proved it to be here diſcharged, ſince the Apoſtle attributes epiſcopal Authority to theſe elders in common, and diſcharges Lordly preheminenc in any of them. Well, what is it that our *Informer* will admitt to be here diſcharged? *domineering and Tyranny*, ſaith he, *which may be the fault of ane ordinary Miniſter towards his flocke*. This is the old popiſh ſong made new again, to which I repon two things. 1. The word κατακυριευοντες is parallel with that of Matth. 20. and Luk. 22. Where peter learned the prohibition, and (as is ſaid) imports indeed *Dominion* but no *Tyrannical domineering*, it being made uſe of by the *ſeventy interpreters* to expreſs Dominion unqueſtionably lawful. 2. The poſitive parte of the precept refutes this gloſs, he ſayes not, *Not Tyrannically domineering*, but uſing Dominion moderatly (which ought to have been the other alternarive branch, if this mans gloſs were true, and the Apoſtle had allowed a lawfull *Lordshipe*) but He adds for the other branch in expreſſing what is injoyned

*being examples to the flock.* Injoyneing thus to feed by example, and a humble Ministery; And this is opposit to all Dominion and Lordship whatsoever, and doth not discriminat only one Dominion from another; which is also apparent in the alternative branche, and positive precept of the above mentioned paralel texts. Besides we might here tell him, That the Episcopal prehemineence, being so many wayes cross to the Scripture rules in pointe of Government, may be truely called a most *Tyrannical Domineereing.* But the reasons of his gloss follows. He tells us; *That this domineering and Tyranny may be the fault of ane ordinary Minister towards his flock, and that the Apostle is not here speaking of Church mens' carriage towards one another, or of their equality or inequality among themselves, but of their behaviour towards the people, who are called the flock, or Gods heritage.* Ans. This is a strange reason, and very hard to comprehend, only Tyrannical domineereing must be understood *because it relates only to the flock.* Can there not be a Tyrannical domineering over the *Clergy* also? And because the Apostle forbids to Lord it over the flock, therefore he forbids not Dominion over the Clergy; The quit contrare conclusion will better follow: If the Apostle forbids them *to Lord it over the flocks*, who were subject to them as their spiritual guides, therefore, *a fortiori*, he much more forbids them to *Lord it over their fellow Presbyters*, who were their equalls in this Spiritual trust and Authority over the flocks; And if it be unlawful to play the Domineering Prelat over one poor flock, it must be much more unlawfull to Act this Tyranny over some Hundreds of both pastores and flocks. So that Ministers, or (if he will) Churchmens carriage towards one another, must be here clearly pointed out by a very necessary consequence from the less to the greater, and the equality of Ministers in their spiritual Government and Rule, by he same topick strongly inferred from this place. It were

ſtrange that the Apoſtle ſhould diſcharge *to Lord it over the flocks*, and yer allow a Lordſhip over *both Clergy and flocks*. But another wonder is, how he comes to excludMiniſters from that tittle of *Gods heritage*, which his party (from whom our *Informer* here proves a ſeparatiſt) do often make peculiar unto [Church Rulers] one would thinke that they ſhould have a ſpecial Intereſt and ſhare in that which grounds this denomination; Are they not the Lords purchaſe, as well as the people Act. 20. Nay they are in a ſingular manner ſuch, and Chriſts glorie; Are they not ſuch as he will never caſt off and alienat Pſal. 94: 14. They are the ſtarrs which Chriſt holds in his right hand; nay, as being ſingularly dedicat to him, they are ſingularly his: as the Levits had the Lord for their Inheritance in a ſpeciall way; So they were ſingularly his, ſet aparte for him beyond all the reſt of the tribes. And are not Miniſters *taken from among the people for his Prieſts and Levits* —— And called therefore men of God, ſtewards of God, Miniſters, Servants, Ambaſſadoures of Chriſt, becauſe of their ſingular relation to him: And as this is a ſtrong diſſwaſive from Lording over the people, that they are *Gods heritage*, who therefore moſt not be the *ſervants of men*, So upon the ground of Miniſters ſpeciall intereſt in this denomination, the Apoſtles argument as to them, is the more forcible. Againe, ſince he ſo expreſly forbids any of theſe Paſtoures *to Lord it over Gods Heritage* (enjoyning them a humble exemplary Miniſtery) and far leſs to exerciſe a Lordly Rule over one another, he eſtabliſhes by clear conſequence (as I hinted) ane equality among them, in their *paſtoral official power* and authority; Withall, the Apoſtle ſpeaking to them indefinitely in this precept without the leaſt *exception and reſerve* as to any one of them: and making their *epiſcopal inſpection* relate to the

*flock* (as this man himself pleads) both these grounds hold out their equality among themselves, and inferrs a discharge of inequality. This *Informers* likewayes would remarke that the Spirit of God here commands *Presbyters to act the Bishopes*, thus indentifying the Bishop and Prisbyter, but without *Lording it over Gods heritage*, the prohibition not to Lord it, is remarkably joyned with the command to Act the Bishop: And referring their office to the flock, he must confess the Apostle acknowledged no *Bishops* whose inspection was over *Pastours themselves*. Thus we see his answer to the Argument against Prelacy from this Text is contrare unto the scope and sense of the Words, yea and inconsistent with it self.

---

## Chap. X.

*The Informers answers to our Argument from Act. 20. and from Tit. 1: 5,7. Philip. 1:1. Ephes. 4:11. For the identitie of* [*Bishop*] *&* [*Presbyter*, ] *win nowed, the insufficiencie, and inconsistencie thereof, together with his begging of the question, discovered; and these texts at some length improven against him.*

THE *Doubter* in the nixt place objects [That in the new Testament, Bishop and Presbyter signifie one and the same office bearer, that in Act. 20: the elders in the 17. v. are called Bishops in the 28. v. So in Tit. 1: 5, 7. And therefor *Bishop* and *elder* are the same in Scriptur, and the word elder signifies no more then a Minister of a particular Congregation] Heer he touches

ches a parte but not the strength of our argument from these texts. We argue not meerly from the *Samenes of the Names*, but the identitie of *all the essentiales* of the office, Duties, and Qualifications of the office bearer expressed by these names, when applyed to ane ordinarie office bearer; Particularly from Act. 20. We draw forth these weapons. 1. The Apostle speaking to the elders, tells them that the holy ghost had made them [Bishopes over the flock,] shewing that the Scriptur Bishop set up by the holy ghost, is the Minister or elder who feeds and rules over the flock. 2. The Apostle gives them not only the *Name* of Bishop, but also *the thing*, commanding these elders or Ministers επισκοπειν and ποιμαινειν την εκκλησιαν του Θεου which takes in all the power of order and jurisdiction, and whatever the Diocesian Bishop may pretend unto. 3. (Which is very remarkable) he gives this Charge so these elders befor Timothy, who was now present with the Apostle, and after the first Epistle was written to him, for it was writtin when Paul was at *Macedonia*, and after this Paul haveing *Timothy* with him came *to Miletum*, and gave the elders of Ephesus this charge. Finallie. This was Pauls *last charge* to them, for they were never to see his face more; So that we have here a pattern of the mould of the Gospel-Church in relation to Government as this great Apostle of the Gentiles left it, and consequentlie as all the rest left it, which is conviceingly apparent by comparing this with the parallel 1 Pet. 5. compared with 2 Pet. 1: 14. Hence we exterminat the Diocesian Prelat thus. 1. The Holy Ghosts Bishops were Ministers which he set up to feed and rule the flock immediatly. These, and these only, the Apostle and the Apostolick Church knew, therefore he disowns the Prelat, who pretends to be set over some hundreds of Pastoures and flocks, and is bound to feed no flocke himself. 2. These who watch over the

flocks *immediatly, and only*, have all the *Episcopal power*, both the key of doctrine, and Government committed to them by the holy Ghost: Therefore the Diocesian Prelat, taking and arrogating to himself *the sole power of ordination and jurisdiction*, and leaving Presbyters nothing but the *Doctrinal key*, as his deputies, while he himself preaches to no flock, is ane Antiscriptural Sacrilegious robber. 3. The elders or Pastoures of Ephesus got all Episcopal authority as to order] and jurisdiction, committed to them by Paul as the Holy ghosts Bishops, & the highest ordinarie officers of that Church, in the presence of *Timothie*, without the least hint of any interest that *Timothie* had in or over them, as their Bishope or Overseer therein, or the least hint of any direction anent their dutie to *Timothie* as in that Capacitie, and this after he had gotten *all his directions in the* 1. *Epistle* written to him. And therefore *Timothie* was never set up as a Diocesian Prelat over that Church (as this *Informer* would perswade) and the inspection which he is supposed to have in that Epistle, was occasional, transient, and extraordinarie, and by consequence layes no ground for Prelacie. *Finallie, Paules directions* here were *his last and farewel directions*, therefore this Church was *to continue thus governed* by these elders or Bishops in common: and the Prelatists Plea [that the Apostles set up Presbyters at first, keeping the reyns of Government in their own hands, till towardes the end of their life, and then sett up Prelats over these Presbyters] is here convict of falshood, since neither Paul, nor Peter, the great Apostle of the Gentiles, or the great Apostle of the Circumcision, doe in the least hint any such *Super-institution*, but both of them in their last directions to the Churches, commit the wholl power both of order and jurisdiction, *to the Pastoures of the flocks, in common*, as the only Bishops set up by the Holy Ghost.

From

From 1 Tim. 1: 5, —— 7. The great Argument is not only from the promiscuouse use of the Name [Bishop] & [Presbyter] but from the *forme and mould* of the Apostles reasoning; which inferres not onely the identitie *of names*, but of *the office also*. For the Apostle shewing Titus how the elders are to be qualified, gives this reasone *for a Bishop must he blameles*. This [γὰρ or causal *For*] expressing the knot and connexion of the Apostles argument or reason, doth clearly Import that the office, expressed by both these words, is one and the same; for there is neither sound matter or forme, in such reasoning as this [Presbiters must be so and so qualified, because a Bishop, of a Superior order and degree must be so qualified] So that from hence it is evident that the [elder] is the [Bishop], & *vice versa*, and that no higher Bishopes were by the Apostles constitut in the Churches. Here then, as in the preceeding text, we have not only Bishops and elders getting the same designation by the Holyghost (who knew best the nature of the things themselves, and how to express himself thereanent) but likewayes the *same qualifications, work, and office*; and so the office is supposed to be every way one and the same. Now let us hear, what he sayes to the argument. [He grants that the two words oftentimes doe point out one and the same officer, but denyes that the officer meaned by these words, is never understood above the degree of ane ordinarie Minister. Or that the word [Presbiter, or elder] signifies only the Minister of a single Congregation, & no more.] The insufficiencie and prevarication of which answer euidently appears. For 1. He grants that these two words *Bishop and elder* signifies one and the same officer, *oftentimes*, supposeing that sometimes they express diverse officers, but where can he shew us that the word *Episcopus* signifies one officer, and *Presbiter* another, when the Spirit of God is pointing out therby the Churches standing

ſtanding Officers and Miniſters, and not when either the one or the other is in a gener all ſenſe applyed to ane Apoſtle. 2. The ſtate of the Queſtion is [whither the ſcriptur επισκοπος deſigne a higher ordinary officer then a Presbyter] And this *Informer* ſhould have adverted, that the drift of the argument from the texts mentioned, is to prove the Apoſtles promiſcuous uſe of theſe words in deſcribing the office of the higheſt ordinary office bearers in the Church. Moreover, the Dioceſian [Epiſcopus] is ane ordinary officer, haveing the inſpection over ſome handereds of flocks, and the ſole power of juriſdiction and ordination in the dioceſſe, & is by him held to be ane officer of Gods appoint ment, & by this deſigna-tion of *Biſhop*, as the Characteriſtick of his office, is di-ſtinguiſhed from *Paſtoures* or *elders*. Now, if preſby-terians doe prove that wherever the word *Biſhop* is uſed to point at ane ordinary ſtanding officer in the Church, it imports *a paſtor or presbyter* & no higher officer, they ſufficiently over throw the *dioceſian Epiſcopus* or Biſhop of his mould, as having no ſcripture warrand. And if he grant that in the forementioned Scriptures, & other paſ-ſages where the word *Biſhop* is uſed to point at a neceſſa-rie ſtanding Church officer, it ſignifieth no higher of-ficer then *ane elder* or *ordinarie Miniſter*, he grants enough againſt himſelf, & all that the preſbiterians de-ſire: for there from it followes neceſſarly that their *dioceſian Epiſcopus or Biſhop* contradiſtinct from, & ſu-perior to the preaching preſbyter, is apochriphal & antiſcripturall: Since the preaching preſbyter & *Biſhop*, are the ſame ordinarie higheſt officer in all the Holy Ghoſts expreſſions theranent. 3. Whereas he denyes that we con prove [That the officer meaned by theſe wo-rds, is never underſtood of any above the degree of ane ordinary miniſter] Let him add this neceſſary limitation [when the words are applyed to deſigne ane ordinary ſtanding officer (which he muſt admit, if he ſpeak to pur-

purpoſe) and the proofe is very eaſy] ſince the forementioned Texts, and all the parallels where *elder* or *Biſhop* is thus uſed, doe evince it. Again 4. Since this Informer with his followes have diverſified the *Biſhop* from the *elder* in the manner above expreſt, we challing him as the affirmer, to ſhew in all the new Teſtament where the officer meaned by this Word *Epiſcopus* or *Biſhop*, when pointing at ane ordinary ſtanding officer in the Church, is to be underſtood of any above the degree of a *Presbyter* or *Paſtor* of a congregetion; This lyes upon him to mak good, elſe if *Epiſcopuss* denotte only a *Presbyter*, ſure the cauſe of the *Dioceſian Prelat* is loſt. He fortifies his anſwer with two Reaſons. 1. *We find the name* [*elder*] *given to the Apoſtles themſelves* 1 *Pet.* 5: 1. *Iohn.* 2. 1. *& Epiſt.* 3: 1. *And if Apoſtles be called* [*elders*] *why not alſo* [*Biſhops*]. *Anſ*: 1. The pointe debeateable is [whether the word [Biſhop] and [elder] doe Import the ſame officer, when applyed to a conſtant ſtanding officer in the Church.] His Preſbyterian *doubter* offers the forementioned Texts to prove this, and he anſwers, *That one of theſe names are ſometimes attribut to ane extraordinary officer whoſe formal office is ceaſed.* Now how impertinent this is to the pointe and Queſton let any judge? To prove that *Epiſcopus* or Biſhop, imports ane ordinary ſtanding officer above [a Preſbyter,] and that the Word *Biſhop* and *Presbyter* ſignify not the ſame ordinary officer, becauſe ſometimes the Word *elder* may be applyed to ane *Apoſtle*, is a conſequence, as we uſe to ſay, *a baculo ad angulum*, and known to no logik. 2. We told him already that we prove enough againſt him when we prove that the *Scripture* - *Epiſcopus*, or *Biſhop*, is never found to Import any ordinary officer above the *Presbyter*, and that the Office, Work, Qualifications, & Duties of theſe officers, as ordinary ſtanding officers, are one and the ſame. 3. The Inſtance of the Apoſtles aſſumeing the name of *elder*, doth in this

fur-

further appear to be ane impertinent exception to the Argument adduced, in that the office of ane *Apostle*, is in Scripture both by a proper name, work, qualification, call, &c. diversified and distinguished from that of ane *ordinary elder*; so that though in a general sense the *Apostles* be called *elders*, their *Specifick* difference from the *ordinary elder* is apparent: But this *Informer* will never shew the least vestigies of the *Diocesian Bishops* distinction from the preaching *elder* or Presbyter in any of these respects? And therefore his reason added here viz. *The Bishop may be called ane* [*elder*] *as well as ane Apostle, and yet be ane officer superior to him*, is a begging of the Question, since he cannot shew that there is a higher ordinary officer then a *Pastor* or *Presbyter*, appointed in the Word, nor can he shew any designation, qualification, work, or ordination of his *Diocesian Bishop*, as distinguished from the *Presbyter* by the Prelatists; And therefore the Apostles being called elders can no more ground a distinction betwixt the *Bishop* and the *elder*, then betwixt the *Pastor* and the *elder*, whom he acknowledges to be one and the same, or betwixt the *Minister* and the *elder*. I suppose one should alledge the *Pastor* to be a higher officer then the *preaching elder and Presbyter*, notwithstanding that in Scripture their names, and qualifications are one, as of *the Bishop* and *Presbyter*, and should ground his opinion on this *Informers* reason here, (viz.) [that though the two words are promiscuosly used often times of the same officer, yet the officer meaned by one of these may be sometimes understood of one above the degree of ane ordinary Minister] what will he say to his own reason, pleading for this fooliish distinction? Would he not say that the [*Apostle*] and [*elder*] are elsewhere clearly distinguished on Scripture, not the *Pastour* and the *elder*, which answer he must here bestow upon himself. Sure this man will not deny but that the various Church officers both ordinary and extraordinary have their proper

fo-

formall *office* is deciphered, and diſtinguiſhed from other offices and officers, As Apoſtles, Prophets, Evangeliſts, Paſtors: and particularly he will not deny that there is ſuch ane ordinary Church officer as the *Paſtor* or *Presbyter*, diſtinguiſhed by his proper deſignation from others, notwithſtanding that the Apoſtles took this name in a general ſenſe: So that from this it followes that if the *Biſhops* proper deſignation, work, ordination, qualifications, as diſtinct from a *Preſbyter*, cannot be produced, he muſt be alwayes underſtood in that ſenſe (viz.) ane ordinary Paſtour and no more: And not as the *Apoſtles* when termed *elders*, whoſe diſtinct *Superior office*, and proportioned *deſignation*, is clearly extant in Scripture.

His 2d. Reaſon and exception to the Argument is *that with us the word* [*elder*] *ſignifies both the preaching, and ruling elder, and that he can upon as good, and better ground ſay, that it ſignifies the* [*Biſhop*] *& the* [*Miniſter*] *both being elders, but of different dogrees* Anſ. 1. When he ſhall make as evident from Scripture, the *Dioceſian Biſhopes* diſtinction from, and Superiority unto the *Paſtor* or *Presbyter-Biſhop* or Miniſter of a congregation, as we have ſhown the ſuperiority of the *preaching elder*, above the *ruleing elder*, and the diſtinction of the one from the other, then his parallel will paſs current, but till then it is a meer non-ſequitur. The Scripture clearly diſtinguiſhes, as we have ſeen, the elder that *rules only*, and the elder that *both laboures in the word and doctrine, and rules alſo*, clearly diverſifying the offices, and allowing honour to the one above the other. Now, let this, or any thing like this, be ſhown as to the *Dioceſian Biſhop* and *Presbyter-Biſhop*; where will this *Informer* point us to ſuch a *diſtinction of Biſhops, & their office and honour* as there is here of the *elders*? Nay, ſince in all directions as to peoples obedience to Paſtors, their is not the leaſt intimation of his ſuppoſed different degrees of paſtours we ſtrongly conclude

the contrare: So that we inferr the distinction betwixt the *preaching* and *ruleing elder*, from the Scriptures clear specifying of different offices, Acts, and degrees of honour accordingly, among elders, but the sucks out of his fingers the *different degrees of Pastors*, and the distinction of the *Bishop* from the *Presbyter* without the least Scripture-warrand. 2. He grosly belies our princples and the truth, when he maks his Presbyterian *doubter* alledge *That the word* [*elder*] *signifies no more but* [*a Minister of a particular congregation*] which he forged to bring in, and give some colour unto, this his 2d. Answer or reason. But *saltem mendacem oportet esse memorem.* A liar, they say, should have a good memory; He he contradicts himself, while suggesting in the objection, that we hold that *elder* signifies *no more then a Pastour*, yet telling us for his answer, that we hold the Word *elder* to signify, *sometimes the preaching*, *sometimes the ruleing elder.* It is enough for our purpose that neither the word *Bishop*, nor *Presbyter*, doe signify any ordinary standing Church officer *higher then a Pastor* or *Minister of the gospel* labouring in the word & doctrine (whither indiscriminatim, or in fixt particular congregations, in the Apostolick times, we need not determin as to our defence here) and untill he prove that either of the names doe signifie a higher ordinary officer (which will be *ad calendas Græcas*) the argument stands good against him. We may here mind this *Informer* that hereafter he alledges that 2 Tim. 4. The *Deaconta* or *Diaconship* is in a general sense attribut to *Timothy ane Evangelist*, yet he would reject it as ane absurd inference to conclude from this that there are *diffirent degries of deacons allowed or appointed in Scripture* Which notwithstanding is *his own consequence* here, and the strength of his answer to the premised Argument. As for what he adds. *That Bishops were afterwards sometimes called Presbyters of their Churches, thogh unquestionably Bishops in his sense, in remembrance*

*berance of the indifferencie of the names in the times of the new Teſtament, though they were ordinarly called Biſhops,* We ſay it is certane that the firſt ſuppoſed *Biſhops*, named in the pretended Catalogues from the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts (of which afterward) were *meer Presbyters*; and if they were called *Presbyters* in rememberance of the new Teſtament tymes, the more guilty were they who afterward made the word *Biſhop* (contrare unto the new Teſtament times and language) the Characteriſtick of *ane office Superior to a Paſtor or Presbyter*, and the rather in that whereas the word *Presbyter* or *elder* is ſeverall times aſſumed by the *Apoſtles* in a general ſenſe, the word *Epiſcopus* or *Biſhop* alwayes denots ane *ordinary Paſtor* (if we except that *Epiſcopatus* in Act 1. Which our tranſlators on the Margin renders *office* or *charge* in a general ſenſe) ſo that when Prelats ambitious invention was upon the wheel, it ſeems they ſhould rather have appropriat to themſelves the word *Presbyter* or *elder*, a fit deſignation for *Fathers* of the Church, as this man calls them.

The *doubter*, nixt offers ane Argument againſt prelacie from Philip. 1. [where the Apoſtle ſpeaks of *Biſhops* in the plural number in that Church, who were only Miniſters, ſince there could not be *many Biſhops over Miniſters in that one Church.*] we ſhall take up here with this hint of argument, only adding, that by confeſſion of Prelatiſts, there was never in *one city* more then *one Biſhop* even when the inhabitants were all profeſſed Chriſtians, much more here where the generalitie of the inhabitants were Heathens and the Chriſtians but a ſmall remnant. So that the Apoſtles ſaluting here *the Biſhops* in the plurall number, *Biſhops of that one Church of Philippi*, and contradiſtinguiſhing them from the *Deacons* whom he immediatly ſubjoyns to them, he muſt needs be underſtood of the *Paſtoures, and Presbyters*, as the higheſt ordinary officers of that

Church. To anſwer this Argument, the *Informer* hath gathered together ſeveral ſcrapes and ſome very odd and inconſiſtent notions. 1. He tells us *that Ambroſe takes theſe Biſhops, not to be the Biſhops at Philippi, but certan Biſhops preſent with Paul when he wrote, & in whoſe name he writs to the Philippians, joyning them with himſelf.* But this gloſs, as it is croſs to the current of expoſitores, ſo to common ſenſe. Paul, who only was the Spirit of Gods penman, joyns here *Timothie* with himſelf in the inſcription, as in ſeverall other Epiſtles, and having taken to himſelf, and Timothie, the deſignation of *Servants of Chriſt*, he doth nixt after this deſcription of himſelf and Timothie, according to his uſual Methode, deſcribe theſe to whom he writes, (viz.) [to all the Saints in Chriſt Jeſus which are at Philippi, with the Biſhops and Deacons] viz, *there, at Philippi*, not with Paul, they being ranked among theſe *to whom he writes*, who are contradiſtinguiſhed from *Paul and Timothy, the directors of the Epiſtle*, and ſuppoſed to be with theſe *ſaints at Philipp*; Otherwayes there is no ſenſe in the Text to read it thus, *Paul and Timothius, to the ſaints at Philippi, with the Biſhops with Paul.* Had the Apoſtle joyned them with himſelf, as he doth Timothy, in the inſcription, they would have been mentioned in that branch of the verſe together with him, and not caſt after the adreſs, and the deſcription of theſe to whom he writes. The Apoſtle in Gal. 1. After he hath deſcribed and aſſerted his Apoſtolick authoritie, he nixt adds, *and all the bretbren that are with me, to the Churches of Galatia.* Thus he takes in many with himſelf in this inſcription, before he deſcribe theſe, to whom the Epiſtle is addreſſed. And ſhould not theſe ſuppoſed eminent Biſhops, have been after this manner joyned with him; Beſids, will any ſay that the *Deacons*, joyned with theſe *Biſhops* in the period of this verſe, were not at Philippi, or

belon-

belonging to that Church, but with Paul? But they are mean men, and their credit needed not to be ſaved by ſuch a conceit as this. All the fear of that *Father* was, leaſt theſe *Biſhops at Philippi*, be found *meer Presbyters* of that Church; And how to ward off this blow, *hoc opus hic labor eſt.* Well, what further anſwers he? He tells us nixt. *That others think they were Biſhops of the Churches about, conveened at Philippie, which Paul knowing of, ſalutes them with the Church: Since he firſt ſalutes* [*the Saints*] *as intending mainely to write to them; and then* [*the Biſhops.*] So wee ſee the Prelatiſts faile every point of the compaſſe, to ſave the credit of theſe *Biſhops.* If *Biſhops* cannot begotten ſett beſide the chaire with Paul, when addreſſing the Epiſtle (this gloſs ſtanding clearely antipod to the Text) the nixt ſhift is, rather then theſe *Biſhops* be degraded to *meer Presbyters*, to ſend for ſome other *Biſhops* to Philippi at this tyme of Paules Writing, that this *caſual Muſtere* of Biſhops *of other Churches*, may warde off the deadly blow which the cauſe will gett, by ſeating all theſe Biſhops at Philippie, as officers of that Chuch; and to compaſs this deſigne, they muſt be but *occaſionally ſaluted* here, and not as *fixed members or officers* thereof; upon the Apoſtles Information (comeing to late to his ears from our *Informer* and his fellows) that there were ſeveral *Magnates* there, beſides the *ordinary* Preſbyters at Philippi. But, which alſo odd, they muſt become ſo humble as to fall *behind the Saints, the perſons mainely written to.* Had our *Informer* left out this clauſe (which notwithſtanding his anſwer did require) Our Prelats *Parliaments order*, Who are *before*, becauſe *behind* the moſt, would have ſaved their reputation ſtill. But many of the Ancients are more ingenuous. *Theodoret* confeſſes *that Presbyters are here underſtood, becauſe their could not be many Biſhops in one city*, on Philip. 1. *Oecumenius*, on Philip. 1. Tells us, *That we are not ſo*

*to understand it as if therewere many Bishops in one citty, but* [t] *hat the Apostle calls the Presbyters, Bishops. Chrisost. ibid.* [a]cknowledges, *That they were Presbyters who were called* [t]*hus, because the names were then common and the Bishop* [h]*imself was called Deacon, and that the distinction of names* [c]*ame afterward.* This conjecture is sib to that other shift to take off the strength of our argument from Act. 20. *viz.* [That these Elders were not Church Officers of Ephesus onely, but the Bishops of all Asia mett together at Ephesus, and sent for by Paul from thence] least if the *Episcopal authority* be found seated in these *Elders of Ephesus*, at Pauls last farewel, it breake the *Diocesian Prelat* all in peeces. But as it is well replyed that since Paul sent to Ephesus for the *Elders of the Church*, it is a groundless conjecture to call them any other Elders then *of that Church to which he sent*, and that there is no hint in the text of any *other Elders* there at that time So this fancie is as fond when applyed to this passage, and may receave the same reply. What shaddow of proof can be produced that therewere any other Officers there at this time then the Bishops or Ministers of this Church? And what Logick, *I* pray, or sense is there in this inference, that because the Apostle first salutes, all *the Saints* or the *Church collective in bulke*, and then the *Church Officers*, *Bishops and Deacons*, or the Church representative in special, that therefore he salutes these Church Officers *as casually there, and not as Officers of that Church.* Beside, had the Apostle saluted them as casually present, they would have been saluted with *every Saint in Christ*, Chap. 4: 21. rather then in the inscription. The *English Annotations* thus sense it [That by the *Bishops and Deacons*, we are to understand the whole Ministery at Philippi consisting of Presbyters, to whom the government of the Church was committed, and Deacons, who not only had the care

of

of the poor, but also assisted the Ministers in their Ecclesiastick function.]

But our *Informer* hath a third *Answer*, wherein, *He grants that these Bishops and Deacons were* [*Officers of this Church*] *and askes where were the ruling Elders* ] *here, and if we say they are included in the word* Bishop, *then he tells us that upon better ground he can affirme, that* Bishops *here signifies both the superiour* Bishop *and the ordinary Minister*, who may be called Bishop as well as *Epaphroditus* is called ane [*Apostle.*] *Answ.* 1. Our Argument from this place and such like, beside the Scriptures silence as to the *Diocesian Bishop*, is, That the *Scripture Bishop* doth therein stand so described and qualified, that it is impossibe to understand him of any other officer then a *meer Presbyter*, which is most manifast here, It being impossible that a multiplicity of Bishopes could be at Philippi, as is universally acknowledged. And if he grant *that these Bishops were officers, of that Church in Philippi*, he must either say they were *meer Preebyters*, which is all wee seek, and the yeelding of his cause, or he must prove that either here or els where, the word *Episcopus* or *Bishop* designes the *diocesian Bishop*, and place a multiplicity of such Bishops here against the old *Cannons*, particularly that of *Nice.* But 2. As to what he sayes of the *ruleing elders*, it is utterly impertinent and answered already. We proved the ruling *elders office*, as distinct from the *preaching elder*, by clear Scripture grounds, and did shew that the Scripture points out *two sorts of elders*, giving them both this generall name of *elder*, & then distinguishing them into *such as rule*, and *such as labour in the word and doctrine*: But this *Informer* will never prove that [Episcopus, or Bishop] designes two sorts of Pastors a higher and a lower, or that there is any difference of degrees in the pastoral office: So that he cannot include here his Superior imaginarie Bishop of whose office the Scripture is utterly silent.

As we may, the *elder* in the *Bishop*. And till he make the Diocesian Prelat appear in Scripture, we must still hold that when *Ministers* are called *Bishops*, they get the *proper specifick designation, and characteristick of their office*, & are not called so in a general figurative, sense or Catachrestice, as *Epaphroditus* is called the Philippians Apostle, or messenger. But how? viz. their *messenger sent to Paul, who ministered to his wants*. Phil. 2: 25. So 2 Cor. 8: v. 23. *Titus* and others are called the *Apostles and messengers of the Corinthianes* viz (as it is there intimat) in that businesse of the collection for the Saincts at Jerusalem, for which end they were sent to the Corinthians. So the Spirit of God in Scripture, both in holding out the distinct office of *Apostle* properly so called (for I hope our *Informer* will not upon this ground make *different degrees of Apostles* as he doth *of Pastors*) and likewayes in the very manner of these designations, and their circumstances, when atribut to such inferiour officers, doth state the distinction betwixt them and ane Apostle in his proper acception, clearly holding out that they had neither *name* nor *thing* of the *apostolick office* properly so called, but that *Ministers* are so improperly only called *Bishops*, He will never prove. But now what is his last shift? *It maybe* (saith he) *their were no Bishops settled as yet at Philippie*, & so it may very well be. But our *Informer* here supposes two things in Question which he will prove *ad calendas græcas*. 1. *That their were Bishops, superiour in office & degree to Presbyters, appointed by the Apostles*. The first and second Answer tells us of Bishops (he means diocesian Bishops) either with Paul when he wrot to Philippi —— Or come from their dioceses (forsooth) and present accidentally there: And haveing told us that the *diocesian Bishops* were among the rest of the *Presbyters Bishops* in his third answer, His last shift is, that they were not it may be, yet sett up at Philippy. But *remark*, that

as all

as all theſe *proteus like* ſhifts and anſwers contradicts one another, So they all lean upon this Egyptian reed, *that the Dioceſian Biſhop is ane officer divinely appointed, and then exiſtant.* Now, how impertinent dealing this is, let any judge. We prove from this and many ſuch like texts, that the *ſcripture Biſhop* is *a meer presbyter*, they in all there anſwers doe coyne gloſſes of theſe Texts, which doe ſuppoſe the *Jus & exiſtence*, of the dioceſian prelat, which is the very *quæſitum*, & the thing in Queſtion. 2. He ſuppoſes that the Biſhop over presbyters (the Chimæra of his own braine) though he was not *ſettled at this tyme*, yet was to be *Settled afterward at Philippi.* But how proves he that the Apoſtle was to ſetle after ward ſuch a prelat there? This is another of their ſhifts, that the Apoſtles firſt ſett up *prebyters*, keeping ſtill the government of the Churches in their own hand, till at laſt towards their end they ſett up *prelats*, committing the government to them. But how doth he or they prove this after-inſtitution of the dioceſian Biſhop? we have already abundantly evinced the Contrary, both that the presbyters were the higheſt ordinary officers eſtabliſhed by the Apoſtles, & that without any ſuch fancied reſerve as this is, the wholl power both of order & juriſdiction was committed to them, & exerciſed by them, & ſuppoſed by the Apoſtles to continow ſo in their laſt farewelles to the Churches: and therfor may conclude that the *Biſhops of Philippi were meer presbyters*: and that Paul acknowledged, & knew no other.

*Arnold*: in his *Lux in Tinebr.*: (on Act. 20. 17. *He called the elders, &c.* repreſents the Orthodox opinion, thus, Epiſcopos & Presbyteros, &c. —— That Biſhops and Presbyters are not names of diverſe gifts in the Church, but of one and the ſame office, becauſe they who are here called Presbyters, verſe 28. are called Biſhops. The Papiſts object (ſaith he as this

Infor-

*Informer* that in these times the *names* were common, but yet the [office] of Bishops and Presbyters diverse. he answers 1. This is to affirme, not to prove. 2. When offices are distinct, there also the names are diverse, 3. there was one office both of Bishops and Presbyters viz. the office of teaching. 4. Upon the Papists suppositi-on there can and ought to be only one Bishop in one ci-ty, but so it is that there were here many, therefore [Bishops] signifie [Presbyters.] Thus *Arnold.* classes our *Informer* among the Papists in this point, and repre-sents our principles as the Orthodox principles of the Protestant Churches, and so in several other passages as we may after shew. *Chamier*, (de Oecum: Pontif: lib. 10. cap. 3.) Haveing represented the Papists glosses upon Matth. 20. — 25 [the Kings of the Gentils] &c. the same with our *Informers*, viz. *That our Lord discharged only that sort of Tyrannical Domination*, & haveing answered and confuted them, as we heard *Junius* and *Whittaker* did before; and haveing prefixed to the 7. chap. this title, *An jure divino* - &c [Whether the Bishop be greater than the Presbyter by divine right] he represents the affirmative answer as *Bellarmins*, together with his argu-ments and confuts them, and haveing proved Presby-ters power in ordination, from [their imposeing of hands upon Timothy], he afterward confuts the Pa-pists, (& this Informers) pretences for Prelacy from the Government of the Jewish Church, & the Apostles Su-periority to the seventy disciples: and adducing Bel-larmin's argument from this passage (act. 20: 28.) to prove that the Holy Ghost sett up Bishops, he answers thus - *locus ex actis alienus est*, &c. ——— that place of the acts is impertinently cited, for from thence it is evident that Bishops and Presbyters are the same, Wit-nes *Jerom.* and others, for they whom *Luke* before cal-led elders, or Presbyters of the Church, those Paul afterward affirmes to have been made Bishops by the

Spirit

Spirit, and indeed for feeding, and (as the latine Interpreter) for governing the Church.] So we ſee *Chamier*: claſſeth alſo our *Informer* among the Papiſts in thoſe his prelatick principles and gloſſes upon thoſe Scriptures. *Calvin* upon Tit. 1: 7. Collects the identity of Biſhop and Presbyter, from the Apoſtle's calling them *Bishops*, who were before called *Presbyters*, and (as we heard above) reprehends, upon this ground, the diſtinction placed betwixt them, as profane and antiſcriptural. The ſame he inferrs upon Act. 20. where the Presbyters of Epheſus are called Biſhops, makeing our *Informer's* great topick anent the calling of ſuch Miniſters Biſhops, *qui primas tenebant in ſingulis civitatibus*, or had a precedency in every city, *a corruption and ſin of thoſe times*. The *Dutch annot:* on Act. 20: 28. obſerve that thoſe termed *Bishops* in this verſe, being called *elders* in the 17. verſe [it doth then appear that in the Holy Scripture there is no difference made betwixt elders and Biſhops.] referring us to Phil. 1. 1. verſe, upon which paſſage they aſſert the ſame thing: and eſpecially from the plurality of ſuch Biſhops in one and the ſame Church, conclude this, referring us to 1 Tim. 3. 1. verſe. and Tit. 1 chap. 5, 7, v. upon which places they obſerue, *that by Bishops and* Elders *one kinde of Miniſtry is ſignified*, viz. the labourers in the word and doctrine, citeing 1 Tim. 5: 17. 2 Pet. 5: 1, 2. and from the Apoſtles deſcription of the Biſhop in the 1 Tim. 3. they conclude that by *Bishop* we are to underſtand *all teachers of the Church without difference*, referring again to the forementioned places. The *english annot.* expreſſe the ſame ſenſe of theſe places under debate, and upon Acts 11. 30, v. adduce both *fathers* and *councells* to prove this point.

The Nixt Scripture argument which the *Doubter* bings againſt prelacie, and the Laſt too, is taken

from Epheſ. 4. 11. [where the Apoſtle reckons up *Church officers*, & makes no mention of *Biſhops*]. Our argument from the Scripture enumeration of Church officers here, and in the parallels 1. Cor. 12: 28. Rom. 12: 6, 7, 8, Is this [That the Holy Ghoſt therein deſcribing purpoſly the various kindes of Church officers, and ſpeaking of the office of the paſtour, makes no diſtinction *of a higher and lower paſteur*, nor gives the leaſt hint of either Name or thing *of a dioccſian prelat*, although both ordinary and extraordinary officers, be enumerat, even the *ruleing elder* and the *deacone*: from which ſilence of the Scriptur, as to this imaginarie Biſhop, we conclud him to be no plant of the heavenly fathers planting, by the ſame reaſon that our divines conclude the pope to be ſuch. To this our *Informer* anſwers. 1. *That it is ill reaſoning, that becauſe ſuch ane officer is not in ſuch a particular place, or, enumeration, that therefor he is no where to be found in ſcripture, for how prove we that the Apoſtle intended in that place, a compleat enumeration* Ans: he is guilty of a palpable forgerie here, whill making his *Doubter* inſtance *in this place only*, as if we held, that there is here *a full enumeration*, wheras he cannot bnt know that presbyterians in this argument againſt prelats, as alſo proteſtants in oppoſition to the papacie, doe, together with this paſſage, joyn the parallels. 1. Cor. 12: 28. Rom. 12: 16. In which places collated, there is found a compleat, enumeration of all Church officers ordinary, or extraordinary, and a diſcoverie of their duties, and gifts who are ordinary officers, even of the very *Deacon*. Lykwayes, we take in with theſe Texts, the ſeveral deſcriptions of ordinary officers, and particularly of *the Biſhop*, & his gifts and duties, found in any other places of the new Teſtamament. And ſince this *Informer* cannot deny the Apoſtles, or rather the Spirit of God his intention of a *full enumeration* in theſe places Collated

ted (Such a full Catalogue of Church-officers being therein found) our argument from the Scriptnres utter ſilence of the Dioceſian prelat in all theſe places, ſtands firme by his own Confeſſion, until he ſhall diſprove this ſilence and prove the Contrary. 2. Wee might tell him alſo, that upon *h s own ground*, even the Silence of this Text as to the Prelat, will prove our point; for it being upon the one hand the Apoſtles ſcop to enumerat the *moſt illuſtrous excellent gifts and offices* given by Chriſt to the Church, for her growth and edification, as his royal Mediatorie Donations upon his aſcention into heaven: and upon the other hand, the Apoſtle deſcending as low in his enumeration, as the *Paſtor*, and *teachar*, whom this man holds to be *officers inferiour to the Dioceſian Prelat*, Certainely upon both theſe grounds, he would have mentioned him in order to this ſcope, had ſuch ane officer been allowed or appointed. And as for this Text, it is enough if we prove that the Apoſtle intended therein though not a compleat enumeration of all, yet of *the moſt excellent* functions and officers given by Chriſt to his Church, amongſt which the *Dioceſian Bishops office hath the prime place* in this mans Judgement. How then (I pray) can he be here ommitted, and ane inferior officer named, His 2d. Anſwer is. *That Bishops are comprehended under [paſtoures] and teachers Bishops being ſuch though of a Superior degree to ordinary Paſtoures.* Ans. firſt that *Scripture Biſhops* are comprehended under the *paſtor* and *teacher*, is certan, but that the *Dioceſian* ſhould be ſo, is Impoſſible, and by him *gratis dictum*. For. 1. he cannot ſhew that in theſe enumerations, the *Superior officer* gets the deſignation of the *inferior*, now he holds the Dioceſian Prelat to be ane office and order Superiour to the Paſtor. *Nixt* this were *no proper enumeration*, as he acknowledges there is here, of diſtinct & officers offices, if they had not all there proper *diſtinct names and deſignations.*

*tions.* And since Apostles, Evangelists, Pastors, are proper designations of distinct officers, and offices, why ought not *the Diocesian Bishop* to have had *his proper epithet*, and to have come in between the Evangelist, and the Pastor, for this was his proper Classe as the higher Church officer. Againe, This answer and shift is the same with that of the Papists to save the pope, for they answer our divines Argument from this Text, *that he is included in the office of the Apostle.* But as we tell them that according to there account and Character of him, he ought to have had a more peculiar designation, So we may say to this *Informer* here. Besides, may not *Patriarches*, and all the rabble of the popes locusts have this pretended for them, that they are included in some of these officers? Sure we may in Charity suppose that if a Papist were pleading thus, This man would tell him, that it were no defence to shape out officers of their own devising, & then alledge they are included in some of these scripture designations, which answer suites his own case, Since he cannot make it appear that the Diocesian Bishop is appointed in Scripture, And we have proved his office to be contrary unto it. *Lastly.* Here lyes [*That if we will have here ane perfect enumeration of all Church officers, we must comprehend* [*ruleing elders, and deacons*] *in some of these words, and why may not he doe so with* [*Bishops.*] Ans. 1. We need not, in order to our scope nor argument from this text, alledge either a full enumeration of all officers, or goe about to includ[elder] and [Deacon] *under some of these words*, It being, enough if wee can shew that the *most eminent Church officers* given for the Churches edification, are here enumerat, & that the enumeration comes the length of ane officer *inferior to the Prelat*, in this mans esteem, down from ane Apostle; which renders our Argument from this Text impregnable. 2. If we should include the *elder and Deacon*, in one of these words, we should but include

clude therein *inferiour officers of divine appointment* in the designation *of Superior*, which he will acknowledge to be no unusual thing in Scripture. But his including the *Diocesian Bishop* is both the including of *a forged anti Scriptural officer* of his own devising: and likewayes, if he includ him under the *Pastor* and *teacher*, ane including and comprehending of *a Superiour officer* under the designation of *ane inferiour*, both which differences doe cutt the sinnewes of Reason and answer.

## Chap. XII.

*The* Informer *offers Scripture warrand for Bishops. His Argument from the Government of the Church under the old Testament, and from the Apostles superioritie to the seventie disciples, examined. The first Argument concludes, a lawful subordination of Church-officers, in generall, but reaches no help to the Diocesian Erastian* Bishop. *The second beggs the question in supposing* Prelats *to succeed the Apostles immediately, and Pastoures, the seventy disciples; and from a Superiority among officers of different kindes groundlesly concludes a superiority among officers of the same kind. No Image of our Prelacy in the Jewish-Church-Government, or in the Apostles superioritie above other Church-officers. The* Informer *contradicts his fellowpleaders in this cause and himself also.*

THE *Doubter* over come by this *Informers* mighty Answers (forsooth) [Confesseth Episcopacie not to be unlawful, and only pleads that it may become ing

inexpedient, and a better put in its place ] Whereupon he promiſes [ That if we will not ſtand out againſt light, he will let us ſee warrand in the word for Biſhops ] and ſo he may eaſily doe. But the Biſhop he muſt let us ſee the warrand for is the *Dioceſian Eraſtian Biſhop, having ſole power in ordination and jurisdiction, bound to preach to no flock, and deriving all his power from the civil Magiſtrat.* Now, when he hath given us Scripture warrand for ſuch ane ordinary Church-officer, as is of this mould under the new Teſtament, *erit mihi magnus Apollo.* Wee ſee he ſtill walks in darknes as to the *State of the Queſtion*, and dare not exhibit to us the mould of the preſent Biſhop now exiſtent, when he offers to produce Scripture warrands for him. His 1. Warrand is; *that under the old Teſtament (ſetting aſide the hie Prieſt who was a Typ of Chriſt) there was a ſubordination among the reſt of the Prieſts, a mention being made of chief Prieſts* 2 *King* 19: 2. *Ezr.* 8: 29. *&c. Matth.* 2: 3. *Act.* 19: 14. *And over theſe againe a chief prieſt under the hieſt preiſt, who only was Typical, ſince two hie prieſts are ſometimes mentioned, Luc* 3: 2, *So there was a ſubordination among the Levites Exod* 6: 2. *Numb.* 3: 18, 19. *with* 24. 30. *v. Neh.* 11: 22. *One is ſet over the Levites, called by the Greek, Epiſcopus, and another over the Prieſts v* 14. From all which places he concluds, *That ſubordination among Churchmen is no ſuch odious thing as ſome believe* ] *Anſr.* If this be all the Concluſion which this man drawes our againſt us from the premiſed trite argument of *Bellarmin* and others, viz. *that there is a ſubordination among Churchmen*, It will never help him, nor wound our cauſe in the leaſt; for as we grant without the leaſt preiudice thereunto, that there is a ſubordination, both of Courts and Church-officers under the new Teſtament, Paſtours being above ruleing elders, and they aboue Deacons. Presbyteries alſo being above Kirk Seſſions, Synods above Presbyteries, National aſſem-

aſſemblies above Synods, as the Jewes had there Supreme *Sanhedrin*, Exod. 24. 2 Chron 19. And alſo betwixt the *Sanhedrin* and *Synagogue*, a middle Eccleſiaſtick Court called πρεσβυτέριον the Presbytery Luk. 22: 66. Act. 22: 5. and alſo their leaſt Sinagogue - Judicatorie, wherein was both ruleing, and cenſures. Act. 26: 11. Compared with Act. 9: 1, 2. And with Mark. 5: 35, 36. Act. 18: 8. Anſwerable to our Kirk Seſſions. which is largely demonſtrat by *Mr Gilleſpie*, *Aar. rod.* lib. 1. Cap. 3. pag. 8. to 38. As this (I ſay) is clear, ſo it is evident, that it is much more then a meer ſubordination of Courts or officers, which he moſt prove if he will conclude any thing to purpoſe againſt us, viz, The Prelats ſole deciſive power, and negative voice in judicatories, and their deryvation of all their authority from the Magiſtrat as his deputs, in their adminiſtration. Now, from the ſubordination of Courts, or officers, mentioned uuder the old diſpenſation, to conclude [the lawfulneſs of a Prelat (a pretended Miniſter of the new Teſtament) his taking from other Miniſters all the power of Government, contrary to our Lords expreſs command, his laying, aſide the preaching Talent, and giving up all the eccleſiaſtick authority which he pretendes unto, to one who is not, *Qua talis*, ſo much as a Church member] is a wide and wilde concluſion: yet that this is the concluſion which he muſt infer to prove his point, is beyond all Queſtion.

2. Giveing, not granting to him that there was under the old diſpenſation ſuch a Hierarchy as he pleades for, and ſuch a difference of degrees among Church officers, as he repreſents, how will he prove this conſequence [that the Government of the Church under the New Teſtament muſt be *thus moulded*, and have the ſame degrees of Miniſters, as the Jewes had of Prieſts and Levits] this Connexion he ſuppoſes here, and offers afterward ſome ſmatterings in proof there-

of,

of, but with what succeſs we ſhall ſee with in a *little*. Will he ſay that it is lawful to bring into the chriſtian Church every point of the jewiſh policy? *Biſſon*, ane Engliſh Biſhop (even in pleading for Prelacie) will give him the lie if he ſay ſo, and ſhew him the diſparitie betwixt their Church government and oures: *Perp: Gov. Chap.* 2. [for the tribe of Levi (ſaith he) was neither ſubjected to the Government, of another tribe, nor without manifeſt confuſion could it want all Government, wherefore as all the reſt, ſo this tribe alſo had its proper Magiſtrats, to wit, its, Pinces Elders, judges &c.

——— He adds, that the Jewes Law contained in the books of Moſes, comprehended the mould of their civill Government, and the Prieſts and Levits being moſt skilful in this knowledge, we need not wonder that they were placed in the ſame benches with the judges] (this we offer to our *Informers* obſervation, to ſhew how this Biſhop Pulles his eare in argueing from the Prieſts ſitting in civill courts numb. 11, To Juſtifie our Prelats civill rule) but now to our purpoſe in relation to Church government, he adds further [that the offices of the Sanctuarie, and rites and ceremonies of the Sacrifices, from which all the other tribes except the Levites were reſtrained, were not of one kinde; So that it needs be no wonder that theſe degrees of the adminiſtrators were diſtinguiſhed according to the diverſitie of *offices and ſervices*. But in the Church of Chriſt, the Word and Sacraments concredited to all Miniſters without diſtinction, as they are of one kinde, neither admitts any difference of adminiſtration, or celebration, ſo neither doe they require *different degrees of Miniſters*] Thus he. Sure had our *Informer* liſtened unto this information of this Father of the Church (as he ſpeaks) he would have ſpared this Argument as not worth the repeating. The Miniſtry of the Levites who ſerved in the ſojourneing Tabernacle, is compared to warrfare

warrfare Numb. 4. Becauſe of the Militarie order which the Prieſts and Levits obſerved in their externall Miniſtry. Where there was one common Temple, a common Miniſtry of the prieſthood, a thouſand adminiſtrators in every family (the twenty four families who ſerved each their week in the Temple being called *courſes* by Luke, & *ſtationes* by the *Talmudiſts*, the term being borrowed from warrfare, as *Scaliger* obſerves (*in Canonibus iſagogicis*) it is no ſtrange thing if in this Miniſtry, and Prieſthood, their were ſuch degrees of adminiſtrators; but the Prieſtſtood being changed, there is made of neceſſity a change of the law, ſaith the Apoſtle Hebr. 7: 12. And the policie ſuitable to the ſtate of that Church muſt by neceſſary conſequence be changed alſo.

3. The antecedent of the Argument from that policie, will be a harder taske then he imagines, and this *Informer* would be quite out if put to draw us the Image and lineaments of our preſent prelacie in the Jewiſh Church Government. For 1. We cleared above that the Eccleſiaſtick Sanhedrin was diſtinct from the civil, and that the prieſts had a diſtinct independent authority and miniſtery: But the prelats derive all their ſpiritual authority from the Magiſtrat. 2. He cannot ſhew that either the Highprieſt, or any inferiour prieſts had the *ſole deciſive Suffrage* in their eccleſiaſtick Courts, or ſuch a negative voice as the prelats exerciſe & aſſume in their pretended Synods and presbyteries. The learned *Junius* will informe our Informer (*De Cler. Cap.* 24 *Not* 13.) *That, par conſortium honoris & poteſtatis fuit inter ſacerdotes, ſed ordine impari, qua familiarum, qua temperis reſpectu. Penes conceſſum ſacerdotum ex lege fuit ordinaria juriſdictio eccleſiaſtica* That is, *Among the prieſts there was a like participation of honour and power, though in a different order: partly in reſpect of families, and partly in reſpect of times, the ordinarie eccleſiaſtick juriſdiction belonged*

*to the aſſemblie of the prieſts according to the Law.* Thus he. Sure then it belonged not to the Highprieſt alone, farr leſs to any inferiour prieſts, and therefore none of them all had our prelats negative voice in judicatories, or a ſole deciſive Suffrage, ſo that they were farr from our prelats principality as to directive and corrective power. And therefore though we ſhould grant that his argument will hold as to our being oblidged by the policie of the Jewes, and to have the government of the Goſpel Church this moulded, yet our preſent hierarchie is ſo different from it, that it will not help his cauſe in the leaſt.

But the *doubter* objects [that there ought not to be ſuch a ſubordination under the new Teſtament.] To which he anſwers, [*That the Old Teſtament-ſubordination being to maintaine order and unitie in the in the Church, there is the ſame reaſon for it under the new, and ſtronger, becauſe the Chriſtian Church is of larger extent then the Jewiſh, and the danger of ſchiſmes, and the neceſſity of preventing them, the greater: And what better way for this then Gods way thus exemplary pointed out to us, although the New Teſtament gave no other ground, Gods own model being beſt for the Church.*] I anſw. 1. He muſt plead for much more then *a meer ſubordination of Officers*, if he ſpeak to the point, as is clear from that is ſaid. And his *Doubter* (if he had dealt fairely) ſhould have objected [that the New Teſtament Church ought not to have *the ſame mould of government* that the Jewiſh had, and that there is a vaſt diſparitie betwixt their prelatick Eraſtian Hierarchie, and the Jewiſh Church-Government] Both which grounds doe break the force of his argument. But it is good that our *Informer* hath the doubters arguments and objections of his own moulding. 2. Though he know reaſon of a ſubordination under the Old Teſtament (he ſhould have ſaid *of that particular mould of government which the Jewiſh Church had*) but his general one, to maintaine order and

union

union in Gods Church (he should have said *in that Church, under that special dispensation,*) yet we have shewen him some Reasons of their particular policie which doe not reach us. And shall onely resume to him that we have neither. 1. Such a distinction of tribes. Nor 2. A common Temple, and common Ministry in one Temple for the universal, or for any National Church, as they. Nor 3. Have we such types and shaddowes, from which (as upon the former grounds) this mould of government did flow. Nor 4. Such various sanctuarie offices, and degrees, and varieties of administrations, requiring (as Bishop Bilson hath told him) such varietie and different degrees of Administratores, the Word and Sacraments being concredited to all Ministers without distinction &c. Besides, hath not the Apostle in the forementioned passage, Hebr. 7: 12. Given this *Informer* a sufficient Reason why wee are not tved to the same Policie, viz because that the *Priesthood is changed,* (i.e.) their particular frame of Church officers, & that therefore there *is made a change of the Law,* that is, of the legal ordinance both of worship & Government. 3. Dare we say that Christs Church under the New Testament may have every mould of government which may be in it self, or in respect of some circumstances, commendable, and subservient to these ends of order and union? Where is Christs faithfulness as a Sone over his own house, beyond that of Moses? Where are all the New Testament prescriptions in point of government, Officers, Lawes, Censures, if the Church thereof like *a Tabula rasa* may have any government introduced into it, which may be *invts own time and place* good, and Ministers framed according to the Old Testament dispensation?

4. How will our *Informer* extricat himself as to the Jewish High priest in maintaining this Answer to his doubter? Was not his office *a special mean of order and*

*unitie in that Church, and to prevent schismes and divisions?* And is there not the same reason that the Christian Church should be thus kept from that evil by a supream Highpriest or bishop? What better way for this, then Gods owne way? And what better pattern for modelling the New Testament-Church in point of her government, then this pattern? Surely the Pope will thank him for this. I know he sets aside (in contradiction to *Saravia*, as I shall shew) the Highpriest in his argument, as a Type of Christ, the man forsaw that this would cast his argument in to ane intire Popish mould; but he is not so forseeing as to prevent his being snared by his own reason, & caught in the brieres of contradictions. For 1. He dare not deny that this Officer was a singular *Mean* of their *order* and *union*. Hence he must grant that his answer to the doubters objection is naught, and that Gods way of preserving order and union in the New Testament Church, is different from his way, and the means of preverving it under the Old, and that the *Samenes* of the *end* of Gods ordinances and institutiones under both dispensations, will not plead for holding *the same institutiones*. Was not order, union, and the edification of the Church, the great end of all the Mosaical Ceremonies and Pedagogie. Were not the Jewes for this great end of order and union to keep their solemne Feasts? To go up to Jesusalem solemly and joynly three tymes in the year? To have one common Temple, one Altar, &c. And must therefore the Christian Church observe the same ordinances and institutions? 2. How will he prove that the inferiour Priests were not Types of Christ as well as the Highpriest? Dare he say that their praying for the people, and their sacrificeing, were not typical of Christs intercession and sacrifice, as well as the praying and sacrificing of the High priest, though not in the same degree of eminencie? I grant that the Apostle (Heb. 5.)

speaking

speaking of the authority and honour of Christs Priesthood, presentes the legal type thus; *Every Hie priest taken from among men, &c.* Yet if we shall consider that Hebr. 10. discoursing of the efficacie of Christs sacrifice in opposition to the legal, he sayes in the 11, & 12. Ver. *And every Priest* (simply, not evrie High-priest) *standeth dayely ministering & offering the Same sacrifices, which can never take away sin, but his man after he had offered one Sacrifice for sins, &c.* It will be evident that the inferionr priests were also Types of Christ. So that he should either have taken in the High-priest into his argument, or excluded together with him, the inferiour priestes upon the same ground. For *majus & minus non variant speciem rei.* If he say that he is not speaking of their Sacrifices, but of their Government, which was not typical. Answ. Why might he not then have taken in the High-priest upon this ground, since these are as well distinguishable in him, as in the inferiour Priests: So that he might have been excluded from having any thing to do with the Type in pointe of his government as well as they. And for his single eminencie, it drew along with it those degrees of inferiour priests and Levits, (in his principles) which are mentioned: so that if the one must evanish as a Type, in the same manner must the other. 3. It will much puzele this *Informer* to prove, that the Highe priest in respect of his *government* was a Type of Christ; Sure he will find this denyed by his fellow brother in the cause, *Tilen* in his *Parenes:* (Cap. 2) *in summo Sacerdote ceu pontifice, non typi solum sed ordinis ratio conspicua &* —[In the highpriest, the type is not only conspicuous, but the reason of order, for he bore not a type or resemblance of Christ in respect of the Kingely and judiciary power which Christ hath, who otherwayes should haue had the dignitie, both according to the order of Aaron, and the order of Melchisedeck, that is, bothof a King and a priest.]

*Iunius*, a greater then he, (*de Pontif lib. 1. cap. 6.*) distinguishes these in the Highpriest. ——— *in summo Sacerdote considerandi a, non solummodo ratio typi, sed etiam ordinis & politiæ,* ——— [We must consider in the High priest not only the reason of the type, but like wayes of order and policie, &c.] then he addes the abovementioned reason; So that in this argument, and his way of pleading for prelacie upon the ground of the Jewish policie; He will of necessity introduce a pope into the Christian Church: Which will be convincingly clear, If we shal in the 4t. place consider, that our *Informer* in this argument having set aside the High priest, *as onely typical*, tells us of another single *Chief and High priest under him*, and tels us in answer to the premised objection, that this method of the Jewish government (with this Chief or high priest, distinct from the typical priest) *is exemplarlie pointed out to Christians as Gods patterne for modelling the gospel-Church government.* So that without all shadow of evasion his argument pleads for a chief patriarch over the Christian Church, as being a parte of the Jewish policie obliging us, and exemplarly commended to us for our imitation. Moreover, I would know what he would say, If one should plead for retaining of all the judicial lawes of the Jewes upon his two grounds. 1. As not being typical. 2. As being Gods excellent means for order and union, and commended exemplarly unto Christians to the same end, what better patern for modelling our government and lawes then this patern? Likewayes will he say that every peece of the Jewish antiquated pedagogie was properly typical: And that we are bound to reteane as of a moral perpetual nature whatsoever thing in their policie was not such. Surely there were many things depending upon the particular exigences, and state of that people, both as a Church under that old dispensation, and as a Commonwealth regulat in its

civil

civil Lawes immediatly by God, which no found divines doe call Typical, and yet doe hold that they oblidge no Church or state under the New Testament.

For a conclusion of this argument, I shall tell this *Informer* that he grosly mistaks these Scripture expressions (at least in the judgment of some learned) anent the Chief Priests 2. King. 19: 2. &c. When taking them to denot different *ecclesiastick degrees* among the priests in *their spiritual function*: these chiefnes (to speak so) or principality among the priests, being meaned of a civil principality existent in that Tribe before the priesthood was therein established: and that they were called *Chief-priests*, or Elders of the priests, did flow from this, that this Trybe (subject to the same Princes as at the first) was afterward *set apart for the priesthood*, for Aaron and his Soones were chosen to be priests Exod. 28. but the whole Tribe was not assumed unto the priesthood before Numb. 1. Yet in the meane while the tribe of Levie (Exod. 6.) had the Heads of their families & their Princes. The Scripture then speaking of the tribe of Levie *as a Tribe simply*, ascribes to it the same policie with the rest of the tribes, & Princes of the several families by the right of primogenitur: Thus both priests and Levits had their chiefe men and presidents. But *as a Trike separat to holy things*, it had *its peculiar policie*. One was chief priest onely by Gods appointment, at whose hand all the rest of the priests were. 1 Chron. 24: 24. And at the hands of the priests were the interior Levites, in their several services. David in distributing them in their several Temple offices, did not set the Princes over them as such, but onely having numbered them after the Heads of their families, and by their lotts or Courses, did assigne to them their service of the Temple, upon Gods command by the mouth of Gad and Nathan, the more

to facilitat this Sacerdotal tribe, their comeing unto, and returneing from the Temple. The Chief of the families then, are not upon this ground *Princes or Chief* as to the *Holy Miniſterie*; for there was but one onely high prieſt, all the reſt as well the heads, as the families themſelves, were at the hand of the highprieſt in the Miniſtery of the Houſe of the Lord, 1 Chron. 24: 19. Where the Chief or head in matters ſacred, had no more power then the wholl body. So was it in the diſtribution of the Levits into their ſeveral claſſes by their Heads Chap. 23: 27, that they might be at the hands of the *Sons* of Aaron in the Temple Miniſtery. So that none of his citations doe amount to any proof of his fancied degrees and ſubordination among either the prieſts or Levits in *their ſpiritual functions*, or any other waye then in their civil capacitie as a Tribe; neither had the two high prieſts (mentioned Luc. 3.) The leaſt warrand in Gods inſtitution, but this is acknowledged to be a corruption in their Government then creept in among other corruptions: and ſince he drawes his firſt inſtance of the Levits ſubordination from Exod 6. before that tribe was ſet apart at all to the Holy Miniſtery, that paſſage at leaſt, and (as I ſaid, in the judgment of ſome) its parallels alſo aftermentioned by him, doeſpeak of the Civil Government and ſubordination of the Levites in that capacitie; and that any of their Chief rulers are by the Greeks termed *Epiſcopus*, is a very poor argument to conclude their Eccleſiaſtick rule, it being notourly known that the beſt Greek Authores put his deſignation upon Civil Governoures.

This ſubordination among the Levites in Exod. 6: 15. is unqueſtionably civil upon the ground aſſigned. And numb. 3. It is evident that the heads and princes of Families are numbered. And accordingly the heads and Chief of the families, 1 Chron. 24. and in Neh: 11: 14. He that is ſet over the prieſts, *is the ſon of one*

of

*of the great men* (Haggedolim), or eminent in parts and place as many take it. 1 Chron. 24: 4. before the diviſion and order is ſet down, its ſaid, there were *more Chief men found* of the ſones of Eleazar, then of the ſones of Ithamar, &c. all which doth much plead for this aſſertion, but we need not be peremptor in preſſing this, ſince the weight of our anſwer lies not upon it.

Our *Informer* comes nixt to his *New Teſtament proofes* for Biſhops and produces firſt, *the ſuperiority of the twelve Apoſtles above the ſeventy Diſciples.* Where 1. Wee ſee, He is ſtill in the clouds of *a general ſuperiority*, which is farr from the *Prince-like Arbitrary, and Eraſtian ſuperioritie* of the Dioceſian Prelat now exiſtent, and whom he undertakes to plead for, which this *Informer* (Had he intended to have informed right) ſhould have condeſcended upon. Had the Apoſtles ſuch a ſuperioritie over the ſeventy Diſciples? Were they ſubject to the Apoſtles as their Rectors and judges? Did the Apoſtles (as our Prelats) aſſume a Sole Deciſive, concluſive ſuffrage, and a negative voice over Church Judicatories, notwithſtanding of their extraordinary and high prerogatives? Did we not ſee the contrary exemplified in that meeting of Apoſtles with ordinary Miniſters, Act. 15? Had the ſeventy onely a derived precarius Miniſtry under the twelve Apoſtles, as their Vicars & Subſtitutes in their Miniſtration? Had they no Intereſt in the Church-Government but upon the Apoſtles meer pleaſure. As *Curats* are now in all theſe reſpects ſubject to their Prelats? Had not the ſeventy their miſſion, their inſtitution, immediatly from Chriſt as well as the Apoſtles themſelves? Were they not conſequently to exerciſe their Miniſtery upon this ground, without ſuch a ſervil dependance upon the twelve as Prelats doe arrogat to themſelves ane arbitrary principality over Miniſters?

Were

Were the twelve to *rule only*, and to committ the preaching worke to the seventy as their deputes, as our Prelats now doe? Or were they not rather to help forward the great harvest, and the work of the Ministery, together with the Apostles themselves? So that this *Informer* will never find the least shaddow of ane Episcopall superiority here. But 2. Granting that the Apostles were officers in *a superiour degree* to the seventy, which is the utmost Conclusion which he can draw from Scripture, how will this infer *a superiority* among officers of the *same degree*. We grant the Apostles were superior to Evangelists, they againe to Pastoures, *Ergo*, one Pastour may be a dioceſian Prelat over hundereds of other Pastours, is a consequence known to nologick. Christ appointed both extraordinary, and ordinarie officers in their severall degrees, as Apostles, Evangelists, Pastours: Ergo, he appointed different degrees of Pastours, hath no connexion imaginable. 3. Tht basis of his argument lyes in this [that the Prelats are *immediat succeſsours* of the Apostles in their degree of superiority to the seventy Disciples, and *Pastours* come after the seventy in their supposed subjection, and are not the *Apostles immediat succeſſours* in the ordinary Ministery] but this, as the τὸ ζητούμενον, the quesitum or question, must be proved, not begged and supposed by him. We did already evince the contrary, viz, That the Pastour to whom is committed the Ministery of the Word and Sacraments, and both the keys, immediatly from the Apostles, are the higheſt ordinary officers, and the Apostles immediat succeſſorus as to both order and Jurisdictione. But the *doubter* and I object furder [that the Apostles superioritie over the seventie, was extraordinary, personall, temporarie, and to ceaſe with themselves.] In answer to this, *He grants that in some things their priviledges were extraordi-*

*nary*

*nary, and to cease with themselves, such as their immediat cal. ling, their sending to all nations, their infallibility, gifts of tongues, or whatever was necessar for the first founding of the Christian Church. but in other things wherein they were superior to other Ministers, their power was not extraordinary and temporarie, but still to be continued, such as ordination of Ministers, and governeing them by ecclesiastick authority; in which power the Bishops succeeds them, who are [the children in stead of the Fathers] as Augustin applies that of Psal. 45, v. 19.* Ans. 1. Then it seems that with him the *Episcopal office* properly succeeds to that of *the Apostles*, and is a continuation of their power in ordination and jurisdiction over Pastours, which contradicts his second answer to our Argument from Ephes. 4 viz [that Bishops in that place may be comprehended under the the *office of Pastours & teachers*] For here he makes their office the same with that of the Apostles as importing ane authority in ordination and Jurisdiction over Pastors and teachers, and so he should have said rather that it is comprehended under the *Apostolick office* 2. He yet againe contradicts himself in this answer whill granting [that whatsoever was necessary for the first planting of the Christian Church *is a privilege ceased with the Apostles*] and yet making their *power of ordination of Ministers*, and in governing them, to be *still necessary*, he must understand it as performed and done by them, since therein he imagins the pattern of episcopall power to ly: For other wayes the Presbyterians doe hold and prove that ordination by the Presbytery, and Government by Presbyters collegiatly, is still continued and necessarie; This he will not allow, and so must understand it of the manner wherein the Apostles performed this at first. Now I say, their Apostolick power in ordination and Government as exercised by them at first, *was necessarie for the first founding of the Church.* For 1. Their power of ordination

dination was of *equal lim'ts and extent* with their miſſion to all nations — *Goe diſciple all nations*, I hope he will grant was extraordinary, as being neceſſary for the firſt founding of the churches, *Ergo*, ſay I. ſo was their power in ordination and Government of Miniſters, ſince it was of a like nature, and of the ſame extent; for to what ever nations they were ſent together a Church therein, there they were to *ordaine Miniſters, & govern them by eccleſiaſtick Diſcipline*, which he makes to be *the Bishops office*. 2. Their ſole power in ordination and Government, here ſuppoſed, by him, did certainly preſuppoſe the Chriſtian Church *in fieri*, where of they were to be founders. Firſt They were, as Chriſts immediat extraordinary Ambaſſadours, to convert and bring in Churches, then to plant officers, & the Goſpel Government in them; Now, who will ſay but this power was *neceſſary for the firſt plantiug of the Churches*, and ſo comes under the Character of theſe things which this man acknowledges to be expired: Surely where no other officers were to concurre, the Apoſtles of neceſſity behooved to ordaine ſolely, and their Apoſtolick Inſpection over them did neceſſarly depend upon, and flow from, *their Apoſtolick extraordinary miſſion and infalibilitie*, So that this power in ſo fare as Epiſcopall like, was indiſpenſibly *needful for the firſt founding of the Churches* and conſequently muſt be expired by his own confeſſion, the nature and exerciſe of this power ſuppoſeing, and requiring their peculiar miſſion, infallibilitie, and gifts of tongues, which are acknowledged by this man to be expired privileges, neceſſary ry onely at that time. Moreover, the Apoſtles power in ordination and government did include extraordinary miraculous rodes and cenſurs, & a power in coerceing the rebellious, thus Peter ſtroke Ananias and Sapphira dead for their lying which was a fearful Apoſtolick Cenſure, put forth by his Apoſtolick autho-

authoritie at that time, Paul ſtroke Elimas the ſorcerer blind for withſtanding the truth; beſides, their power in ordination at that time, included their miraculous conferring of the Spirit by the Impoſition of hands. 2 Tim. 1: 6 Act. 19: 1, 2, 6. Now, all theſe Apoſtolick priviledges (which this man muſt needs acknowledge *upon his own ground* to be expired and extraordinarie) being neceſſarily included in, & eſſential unto the Apoſtolick power, the nature and exerciſe thereof muſt be expired alſo. Wee ſhall offer here to the *Informer* a diſtinction of the learned *Junius*, who in his anſwer to *Bellarmins* argument for the Apoſtles Epiſcopal ſingular power, from that word *Shall I come to you with a rod*, diſtinguiſhes the ordinary and extraordinary rod, *ſecundum illam, &c.* (de Concil. lib. 2. Cap. 16.) —— that is, *according to the commone ordinary rode. Peter was a fellow Presbyter* 1 *Pet.* 5. *But according to the ſingular and extraordinary, he ſtroke dead Ananias and Sapphira. In reſpect of this commonrode* (ſaith he) *Paul ſaith* 1 *Cor* 5. —— [You being gathered together with my Spirit in the name of our Lord Jeſus] *but as to this ſingular one, he ſaith* [Shall I come to you with a rode 1 Cor 4. 21] this common rode he denyes to have him *in the hand of any one man whither Apoſtle or other, or that they had any ſole or ſingular preheminence in Churches conſtitute.* And this cutts the winde pype of our *Informers* topick and argument here for the prelats power. Which leads to a 3d. Anſwer.

3 We proved already that the Apoſtles exerciſed no ſingular Epiſcopal preheminence in Churches conſtitut, and what they did in churches not as yet conſtitut and *infieri*, is not to the purpoſe by his own confeſſion, ſince it falles in among *thoſe things neceſſary for the firſt planting of the Churches*, which priviledges the acknowledges are gone. That the Apoſtles exerciſed no ſuch ſingle preheminence in churches conſtitut, is abundantly

dantly cleared in the 2. Argument against Episcopacie, where we shewed that neither in ordination, nor excommunication, nor in Ministerial decision of controversies, the Apostles assumed ane Episcopal power in Churches constitut, but had the ordinary Church-officers Presbyterialy concurring with them. Wee likwayes proved in the 8. *Argument*, that the Episcopal power is neither *formaliter*, *nor eminenter*, contained in the Apostles authority, but is inconsistent therewith, and contrary thereunto, there sole directive, corrective power over the dioceſs, as being the proper sole pastoures thereof, their sole decisive suffrage, and Lordly dominion over Church-judicatories, besides their civil rule, like that of the princes of the gentiles, rendering our prelats power *ex sua natura, & in universum, different from the very nature of the Apostles authority*, and the authority of a Gospel Ministery altogether: and consequently it could not be transmitted by the Apostles, to the Church, as any peece of the Gospel Church Government: and by further consequence they are none of *the Fathers or Children* whom the true church, or the Apostles brought forth, but *the Sprius brood of Satanical Antichristian pride.* As for what he addes *of the Fathers making Bishops Successours to the Apostles*, Junius will tell him (De cler. cap 14. Not. 15.) *That this is not to be understood of a Succession from Christs institution-quia nunquam instituit Christus ut Apostolis secundum gradum in ecclesia succederetur, because Christ never appointed Successors to the Apostles in the Church according to degree* — And that the fathers understood it of a succession *ex simili, non ex pari, a succession of similitude, not of partie* and of a similitude *secundum quid, or imaginary*, according as Prelats were then moulded.

---

CHAP.

## Chap. X.

*The* Informers *great argument for Prelacy, from the pretended Episcopacy of Timothy and Titus. Their Episcopal office disproved, from the office of* Evangelist, *ascribed expresly to the one, and by good consequence to the other, from many circumstances of the sacred text, and the judgement of Interpreters. The* Informers *pleadings from there power in ordination and jurisdiction, supposed in the precepts addressed to them thereanent; from the necessity of this power, the concernment of of after-ages therein, &c, examined. The unsoundenes and inconsistency of his arguing and answers upon this head, several wayes discovered.*

THe *Informer* presents unto us Nixt, the pretended Episcopacy *of Tymothy and Titus at Ephesus and crete*, and the *Doubter* alledging [that Paul calls all the *Ministers* at Ephesus and crete, *Bishops*,] He rejoynes *That Tymoth. and Titus were Bishops as the word επισκοπος or Bishop was afterward taken, that is, had a power in ordination and jurisdiction over and above inferiour Ministers*: This argument from the pretended Episcopacy of Timothy and Titus, as also the nixt, taken from the supposed Episcopal power of the seven Asian Angels, hath been so fully answered and baffled by many, That it is a wonder how he hath the confidence to repone to us these oft sodden coleworts. We gave already a hint in the 8*t A*rgument, of the acknowledged extraordinary function of *Tymothy and Titus*, which is abundantly

ly cleared by many, from their unfixed motion and officiating, their occasional transient imployment in these places, Paules actual revocation of them both there from, the condition of these Churches, as being but in fieri as to their organick settlement and constitution: Particularly, that their power in ordination and Jurisdiction was not episcopall, I prove from these grounds. 1. In Churches already constitut, this Authority was not solely resident in *Tymothy and Titus. Falluntur, qui putant* (saith Calvin, *Instit:* lib:4. Cap. 3.) &c. that „ is, „ they are mistaken who judge either Timothy „ at Ephesus or Titus at crete to have exercised any „ impire or Dominion to dispose of things each at his „ own pleasure, they were set over the people (no „ word of their being set over Ministers) to go before „ them in good and wholsome Counsells in relation to „ the placeing of Ministers, not that they might doe as „ they pleased excluding others. Since Paul himself neither imposed hands nor did excommunicat alone, and since (as I said above) a wholl colledge or Presbytery of Apostles acted nothing *pro imperio*, but in Churches constitut had elders going along with them in all that Sinodal procedour Act 15. Farrless would Timothy and Titus assume this episcopal preheminence, who were inferiour to any of the Apostles, therefore their power in this was not episcopall. 2. That authoritie which was intrusted to the elders and Ministers *in commone*, was not intrusted to any *one officer*, such as Timothie; But so it is that after the Church of Ephesus was exedified and compleated in its organick being, and after Timothy had gotten his charge as to ordination „ and Jurisdiction in Ephesus, Paul committed „ the „ wholl episcopal power to the elders (as is said) before „ Timothies face in his last farewell, Act. 20. therefore he intrusted him with no episcopall preheminence in or over that Church when compleated in its organick being. 3. They whose power stands so circumstantiat

as

as to ordination and jurisdiction over these Churches, that it excluds Episcopale preheminence, properly and formally such, their power in ordination and jurisdiction, cannot be prelatical, nor ground ane argument for prelacie: but such is the power of Timothie and Titus. For 1. As Diocesian Bishops they ought to have been determinatly and designedly set and fixed there, as the officers of these Chnrches, but the contrary appears in the text [I besought the to abide at Ephesus] and againe [I left thee at Crete, and to set in order things that are wanting] which words point at *ane occasional transient, employment there*, not a fixed instalement. 2. In these Epistles they are both Called back without the least intimation of their returneing. 3. If their power was Episcopall and ordinary, then in the apostles prescriptions and rules anent their Successours, their power and authority ought to have been described, *and rules given* touching the gifts, Call, ordination &c. *of the diocesian Bishop*, but the Apostle prescribes no rules for any officer *higher then a Pastour*, & supposes still that he is the highest ordinary officer, in all his directions as to Church government. 4. Add to this, That Paul never calls Timothy, or Titus, *Bishops*, though frequently making mention of them, but *Ministers, Souldiers of Christ, workmen, the Chnrches messengers* &c: 1. Tim. 4. 6. 2. Tim. 2. 3. and 15. 2. Cor. 8. Supposing them his attendants in his Apostolick function; Their accompanying Paul in his Travells is largely described by the divines at the *Ile of wight*. 1. *Timothy* is found at Berea with Paul, Act. 17. 14. then at Athens 15. Thence Paul sends him *to Thessalonica* 1. Thess. 3. 1. Then, having been at *Macedonia with* Paul, he came to him to Corinth Act. 18. 5. Then he is with him at Ephesus, and thence sent into *Macedonia Act.* 19. 22. *Whither* Paul, went after him, and was by him accompanied into Asia Act. 20. 4. He is with him at Troas 5. v. and at Mi-

letum 17. v. where Paul gave the elders his last charge as the Bishopes of that Church. And after this, he is found either in journeys, or absent from Ephesus. For after he is found a prisoner with Paul at Rome, being mentioned as his companion in these epistles written while Paul was at Rome; as that to the philippians, Philip. 1. to philemon. 1. 1. and to the colloss. 1. 2. and he is never found againe at Ephesus, & neer the end of the Apostles pilgrimage, he is sent for to Rome. So *Titus* is found at Ierusalem, befor he came to Crete, Gal. 1. 2. thence is sent for to Nicopolis, Tit. 3. 12. then to Corinth, then he is expected at Troas 2. Cor. 2. 12. and meets with Paul in *Macedonia*. 2. Cor. 7. 6. whence he is sent againe to Corinth 2. Cor. 8. 6. & after this, neer the time of paules death, is found at Rome, from whence he went not to Crete, but unto Dalmatia, 2. Tim. 4. 10. And after this is not heard of in Scripture. So that from their various journeys, the order of them, the time spent in them, the nature of their employment, which was to be the Apostles Copartners in their Apostolick function, and negotiat the affaires of the Churches where the Apostles traveled, and the Sciptures silence touching their being Beshops of any one Church, These divines conclude that they could not be diocesian Bishops.

Others doe remarke severale other pregnant Circumstances in the sacred text. specially relating to Timothy which doe evince him to be neither Bishop at all, nor particularly at Ephesus in the prelatical sense. As 1. That paul stirres him up to diligence upon this motive, that thus he shall be *a good minister of Christ*, not a Bishop of Christ, 1. Tim. 4. 6. He was therefore a Minister Bishop, but nothing else. 2. That when Paul wrote this first epistle to him, he was but newly entered into the ministery. 1. Tim. 1. 3. with Act. 16. 1. 2. 3. &c. And Paul will not have a *Novice to be a Bishop*. 3. He is

com-

commandes to intreat elders as *Fathers*. 4. To Honour them doubly that rule well, therefore he was not to be *a Father over these elders* 5. That he had his gift by the *laying one of the hands of the presbytery*, which could not be *ane episcopall function*. 6. That Paul appointes him to reside there only untill his owue return from Macedonia, to instruct the people for some shorte time until he came to him againe 1. Tim. 3. 14. 15. ——7. That assoone as Paul came from Macedonia to Ephesus, he sent Timothie into Achaia, himself staying at Ephesus and Asia for a season. Act. 19. 22. to 40. v. and from thence he returned to Macedonia, and through it unto Asia, accompanied with Timothy and others, after which we never read that he returned to Ephesus. 8. That Timothie was sent to many churches to confirme and strengthen them, as, to Macedonia Act. 19. 22. To Thessalonica. 1. Thess. 1. 2. 3. To philippi. chap. 2. 19. 20. but never to Ephesus after his first departure. 9. That though he is joyned with Paul in the Inscription of some Epistles. Colloss. 1. philip. 1. and frequent mention is made of him in the epistles to severall Churches, 1. Cor. 4. 17. Philip. 2. 19. 20. 1. Thess. 3. 2. 6. Hebr. 13. 23. Yet there is [altum silentium] of him in the Epistles to *the Ephesians, his own supposed dioceß*. 10 That Paul laid hands upon the disciples who were ordained in that church after his supposed episcopacie. That as Timothie was sent to confirme. Instruct and Comfort other Churches, as Philippi, Troas. So Paul writes to him. 2 Tim. 4. 12. that Tychicus was for this same end. sent to Ephesus: and that he wrote the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians from Rome, whom the Apostle (chap. 6. 21. v. of the Epistle directed to that church) sent to them as a faith full Minister, who therefore lookes liker their Bishop then Timothie. That the same is supposable of Titus is also apparent, both in that he is called (as Timothy) not *Bishop*, but Pauls *fellow helper*, and

that concerning the *Corinthians*, not the *Cretians*, and likewayes in that he is imployed to the church in corinth, after he was left by Paul at crete, as his fellow helper in that church, 2. Cor. 2. 13. and was fixed to no one place of reſidence. That being charged to come to Paul at Nicopolis, his ſtay is found very ſhort at Crete, ſo that after halfa years reſidence there he was ſent to Corinth and Dalmatia &c.

But the *Doubter* acknowledging [Timothy and Titus, their power over Miniſters at Epheſus and crete, ſince they are taught how to ordaine them, what qualifications are requiſite, how to proceed in their tryalls „ and cenſures, alledges that this they had „ as evange- „ liſts & companiones to the Apoſtles in their laboures „ and as appointed to ſettle and water theſe Churches „ which they had planted.] In what reſpect theſe things are attribute to theſe Church officers, will be after examined, when we ſhall conſider how our *informer* pleads for their epiſcopall power upon theſe grounds. But to this exception of the Doubter, he anſwers „ That this ſuppoſes them to be extraordinarie officers, „ whoſe office was not to continue in the Church. And the Doubter affirmeing this. [Becauſe Timothy is called ane *Evangeliſt* 2. Tim. 4. 5. and that therefore he could not be a *Biſhop*] To this our *Informer* Rejoynes „ That in a large ſenſe, he was ane Evangeliſt or a pre- „ acher of the goſpell, but that he was ane Evangeliſt in „ aſtrict ſenſe, can no mor be proved from that ſcripture; „ then that he was a deacon: Becauſe the Apoſtle in „ that ſame place ſayes, fulfill thy deaconſhip, as the „ Greek ſignifies. Or that Philip was ane extraordina- „ ry evangeliſt, becauſe he is called ane evangeliſt Act. „ 2. 8. for he was a deacon Act. 6. and Act. 8. 5. did „ preach the goſpell, but was not therefore one of theſe „ extraordinary evangeliſts whoſe office was to ceaſe in „ the Church. And Finallie, He tells us that ordination „ and juriſdiction is properly no worke of ane Evange- „ liſt

,, liſt but rather preaching and ſpreading the goſpell] Anſ. 1. This man caſts up but a miſt of Inſignificant words in this diſtinction, whereby he endeavoures to elude ſo clear a ſcripture. Timothies Evangeliſtick office, wee ſee, is a gripping argument which our *Informer* would faine Elude, but with what ſucceſs ſhall preſently appear. He grantes he was ane Evangeliſt in a large ſenſe or a preacher, but not in the ſtrict ſenſe, but what that *ſtrict ſenſe* is, in which he denyes Timothy to be ane Evangeliſt, he doth not clear, and ſo his ſtrict ſenſe is left without ſenſe, and his diſtinction muſt flie with one wing. He knew that his aſſigneing ane explication of his ſtrict ſenſe, would have ſo palpably included Timothy, that his evaſion would be preſently ſhut up: therefore he left the other branch of his diſtinction, a meer mute under the clouds, and gives us a diſtinction which ſtands upon one leg. 2. If he will take *Euſebius* ſenſe (*Hiſt.* lib. 3. cap. 33. or 37. with ſome) he will tell him [ that this title is taken but two wayes, either for ſuch as wrote the Goſpel, (in which ſence we grant that none of them were Evangeliſts, or ſuch as taught the Goſpel, and theſe againe were either ſuch as had ordinary places or gifts, or whoſe plaees and giftes were extraordinary, that is, who were not ſettled upon any one charge, but were *Apoſtolorum vice*, having a vicarius care of all the Churches, as the Apoſtles had the principal care.] The Evangeliſts (as *Ambroſe* phraſes it) did *Evangelizar ſine Cathedra*, or preached without a fixed charge. Here, by the way I cannot but admire the inconſiſtant ſubtilty (may I call it ſo) of *Saravia* (*de diverſ. grand. miniſt. cap.* 6.) who, in anſwer to *Beza*, pleading [that the appellation of Evangeliſt is given not to every on who preached, but to the Apoſtles temporary coadjutors in watring the Churches, not yet fully conſtitut &c.] tells him that *Apoſtolus nunquam Timotheum —— Euangeliſtæ nomine compellat.* That the Apo-

*stle no where puts the Title of Evangelist upon Timothy, and that this title was given to none but Philip. Yet immediatly addes-Evangelistæ nomen non nego Timotheo, quem Paulus Evangelistæ opus facere jubet, I deny not the name of Evangelist to Timothy, whom the Apostle bides, do the work of ane Evangelist.* If he deny not this name to him and the thing therein imported, how can he quarrel the Apostles not putting this title upon him, or deny him the title, and the peculiar office therein imported. *Calvin* takes the word here to Import that special extraordinary office mentioned. Ephes. 4. Now that Timothy was such ane Evangelist, is already fully proved and by consequence that the objection stands untouched and unanswered by him. viz. *That he was ane unfixed extraordinarie officer, and not to continue, and therefore any authority which he is supposed to have over this Church, layes no foundation of Prelacie.* For he sayes nothing to this consequence, but admitts it upon the supposition that Timothy was ane Evangelist in a strict sense, and *ane extraordinary officer. Cartwright* answering the *Rhemists* upon this place, takes it in the strict sense mentioned, telling the Jesuites that Paules calling Timothy once *ane Evangelist*, hath more pith in it then all denominations of *Bishop* that others can give him.

3. The *Informers* reason of denying the special office of Evangelist to be here imported, viz *That he might be as well called a Deacon, as being enjoyned to fulfull his Miuistery or Deaconship in the Greek*, is very poor. For 1. It being clear that the Scripture holdes out such ane office as that of *Evangelist*, specifically distinct from other offices. Ephes. 4. (as this man acknowledges) and it being equally certain that this or any other *office* and relation hath a *work and dutie proper and peculiar therunto* and likewayes that the office layes ane obligation upon the person who carryes it, to perform the duties thereof. And Finallie. It being evidently the Apostles Scope, from the consideration of the *office*, to exhort to the *duties suitable thereunto*, its demon-

strable by its own light that Timothy is here stirred up to the duties of that peculiar station & office which we have proved he sustained; & therefor it cannot be understood of *a general Ministery or service*. Will any doubt what the sense of such phrases is, [do the work of a parent] [do the work of a Master] [do the work of a Pastour] who knowes what the office and relation of a parent, master, and Minister is, and that this phrase importes, this precept enjoynes the duties proper to such relations and offices. So the case is here, which none will doubt of but this *Informer* who starts needles doubts, when he cannot answer his presbyterian Doubter. 2. The Deacons office haveing in Scripture its limites drawn, the circumstances of the place where the word *Diaconia* stands, discovers when we are to take it in a generall sense, and when this inferiour officer is pointed out. So it were absurd when Archippus is bidden fullfill his Ministery, or when the Apostle calls himself a Minister, to imagine that the proper formall office of *Deacon* is ascribed to the one or the other: But the *service* there meaned is ane *Apostolicall* and *Pastorall* service, not the service of Tables. Now, *fulfill, or make full proofe of thy Ministery* (as our Translatores doe weill render it, giveing the deacon a peculiar Inglish terme according to the greek sound of the word to avoide confusion) is exigetically the Ministery he is to fulfill, is his *Evangelistick Ministery*, the latter expounds the former, so that in the very phrase it self, the evangelistick office is asserted and the deaconship denyed. The phrase of *Evangelist*, & especially *the work of ane Evangelist*, determins his peculiar office; there being no other Evangelists in the scripture sense, but either those that wrote or published the gospell in that extraordinary way, and Timothy being clearly one of such, it must needs import the *Evangelist* in a peculiar sense, and is distinct from the generall phrase of *Ministery* in the latter branch of the words, which stands limited and restricted by the first part as I said.

Again, since he includes in the generall terme [*Episcopus*] his diocesian Bishop, as distinct from a presbyter, in Philip. 1. and Act. 20. Wee may with farr better evidence take in the peculiar evangelist here, the office properly taken, being both a scripture office, and likewayes so clearly applicable to the person to whom this precept is given, non of which he can say in his case. Moreover, I wonder whither he would admitt this his gloss, if this phrase were directed to a Pastour as it is here to Timothy [doe the worke of a Pastour, make full proofe of thy Ministery] would he think this a good argument or reason to deny him to be a Pastour, because the latter branch of the sentence expresses a deaconship? Sure he would not: or had the Apostle expressed the first branch of the precept thus, *doe the worke of a Bishop*, would he have taken this answer from us, *that Timothy might be as well proved a deacon from that place*? Sure, he would here tel us that the first restrictive phrase, determines the subsequent generall one, and that different offices may well share in generall names.

3. The phrase *of doeing the worke of ane Evangelist*, if we compare scripture with it self, will appear upon Two grounds to import a peculiar Evangelist. 1. Such a sense must needs be admitted in paralleel phrases where the Syntax and construction is like to this, As [*the signes of ane Apostle*] 2 Cor. 12: 12. [*commands of Apostles*] 2 Pet. 3: 2 [*foundation of Apostles*] Ephes 2 20. who will deny but that the word *Apostle* is here peculiarly designeing the office, & why not also [*the worke of ane Evangelist*] especially it being his scope to stirr up Timothy to diligence from the consideration of the office, and others to the greater reverence of him. 2. The terme of *Evangilist* occuring only thrice in the new Testament (viz) Act. 21. 8 Ephes 4. 11. and in this place under debate: since the first Two places, doe beyond all question speak of the *Evangelist* in a strict and proper sense, how (I pray) & why doth it change its signification here? Extraordinary fun-

functions communicats with inferiour offices in the general names, as when the Apostles are called presbyters in a general designatione, but extraordinary names are not made use of to point at ordinary functions, at least when the office is so distinctly pointed at as in this place

4. He stumbleth yet againe here into a materiall contradiction, whil telling us, *That Timothy was ane evangelist in a large sense, that is, One who preached the Gospel*, which he contradistinguishes from ane Evangelist in a strict sense, denying Timothy to be such, and that strictly termed Evangelist had it for his work *to preach and spread the Gospell*, as he seems to insinuat in the close of his answer, if at least he mean it of his strictly called evangelist (for his way of expressing it is very indistinct.) But however he will not say that Timothy was no otherwayes ane Evangelist then in the sense wherein any ordinary Minister is such. And if he understand him to be ane Evangelist as haveing a more large unfixed or universal office of preaching the gospel with extraordinary gifts, and as coajutor of the Apostles, as *Hooker* himself, together with *Eusebius* do take it, as being thus contradistinct from *writers of the Gospel*, how comes he onely to acknowledge him *ane Evangelist in a general sense, as a preacher of the Gospel simply*? I would know what this *Informer* calls ane Evangelist *in a strict sense*, sure he will not say that it is meerly preaching the Gospel which makes up this office, for that he makes the large sense; is it preaching and spreading the gospell with extraordinary gifts ad unfixedly? (as he seems to insinuat by making this *the proper worke of ane Evangelist*) then surely he will not deny but this was *Timothy's worke*, and so he must be ane Evangelist in the strict sense, against what he first asserts. He acknowledges the ordinary Evangelists or preachers, were to preach and spread the Gospell within their Sphere, and so the strict Evangelist

muſt be diſtinguiſhed from them by *unfixed preaching and ſpreading the Goſpell*: which (beſides what is mentioned) will bring a new inconvenienc upon our *Informer* and daſh him againſt his principle of fixing Timothy Biſhop of Epheſus. Yet againe, though Philip preached the Goſpell upon the diſperſion and ſpread it unfixedly, yet he denyes him to be one of theſe extraordinary Evangeliſts whoſe office was to ceaſe: So that he doth (as to this) diſtinguiſh *preaching and ſpreading the Goſpell* from the *proper werke* and characteriſtick of the *Evangeliſt ſtrictly taken* Thus it is hard to know what he calls ane Evangeliſt or how he underſtands it: For neither will he admitt power in ordination and juriſdiction to be ane ingredient in this office, and thus it is neither fixed nor unfixed preaching or government either, that with him will make up this office properly taken, if we conſider the whole ſtructure of his reaſoning.

5. As for what he ſayes of *philip*, *That it will not follow, he was ane extraordinary Evangeliſt, though termed ane Evangeliſt, ſince he was a Deacon.* I anſwer, that Philip was not ane Evangeliſt properly ſo called, is by him poorly and gratis aſſerted, and worſe proved; Learned *Calvin* upon the place tells us „ That his Deaconſhip was a „ temporal and tranſient function, then expired, „ becauſe otherwayes it had no been free to him to „ leave Jeruſalem and go to ceſaria; And that he is „ not here propoſed as a voluntar deſerter of his office, „ but as one who had a more excellent office intruſted „ to him, Which two grounds will put faire to prove that he was not a deacon ſtill. Then he adds [*Evangeliſtæ meo judicio inter Apoſtolos & doctores medii erant, munus enim obibant Apoſtolis proximum ut paſſim Evangelium prædicarent, nec præficerentur certæ Stationi* —— That is, „ Evangeliſts were ſett in the middle betwixt Apoſtles „ and Doctours, had ane office nixt to that of the A-

„poſtles

„ postles and Doctours, had ane office nixt to that of „ the Apostles, that they might every where preach „ the gospell and were not fixed to any Station. He „ gives this reason of his description of the Evangelist, „ Because, (*Ephes.* 4.) the Apostle describing the „ order of the Church doth in such manner substitut „ them to Apostles, as he shews that they had a more „ inlarged office of teaching intrusted to them then to „ Pastours whose worke was tyed to certain places. „ Hence he concludes that Philips deaconship at Jeru- „ salem, was onely temporall, And for some time „ there exercised by him, and that he was after by „ the Church assumed to be ane Evangelist. In which words wee see. 1. He doth upon weightie grounds prove him to have been *no Deacon* at that time wherein he is called *ane Evangelist.* 2. That he was ane Evangelist in the strict and proper sense as it is taken. Eph. 4. —— 3. That Evangelists are officers above ordinarie teachers or pastours, and in this distinct from them (in the judgement of this great divine) *that they were fixed to no certan charge, as they,* but as being nixt Apostles had ane indefinit unfixed Ministery; all which is cross to this mans blunt confused discourse of this mater, and cutts the sinews of Timothy's supposed Episcopacy.

*Lastlie,* Where he affirms *that ordination and jurisdiction were no proper worke of ane Evangelist, but preaching and spreading the Gospell.* 1. I urge him thus, if preaching and spreading the gospel was the characteristick of the Evangelist (He must mean it in a more extensive way then ordinary Pastours if he speak sense) then sure he cannot deny but that Timothy thus preached and spread the gospel as the Apostles Coajutor in many Churches, as is cleared above. Whence it followes by his own Confession. 1. That Timothy's office *was extraordinary and is ceased,* for he affirmes that the office

fice of ane Evangeliſt [whom he calls extraordinary *was to ceaſe in the Church.* 2. That he had *no Epiſcopall authority in ordination and juriſdiction*, He being ane Evangeliſt in a ſenſe beyond any ordinary preacher, and upon the other hand ordination and juriſdiction by his confeſſion, *not being his proper worke who is ane Evangiliſt.* So that Pauls calling him ane Evangeliſt muſt lay him by from being a Prelat, and conſequently all the *Informers* pleading from his ſuppoſed power in ordination and juriſdiction in the 1. Epiſtle written to him, is frivolous and vaine. For in his ſenſe he could not Act both the worke of *evangeliſt and Prelat*, theſe being according to his pleading, inconſiſtent. But nixt, the wonder is, how this man comes to divide [*preaching and ſpreading of the goſpell*] from [*the power of ordination juriſdiction*] ſince he cannot but acknowledge that the Apoſtles did both theſe, and affirms *that their office was epiſcopal*, as we heard above. And after he will tell us that Catalogues of Biſhops are drawen from the Apoſtles, and by *Ierom*, from *marke* the Evangeliſt who was Biſhop of Alexandria. Then it ſeems *this power in ordination* (wherein, with him the Chief part of my Lord Biſhops office lyes) was very well conſiſtent with both the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts *their unfixed inlarged preaching and ſpreading of the goſpell*; The Apoſtles unfixed preaching & ſpreading of the goſpell, ſure he will not deny: nor can he deny to marke, the Evangeliſts office in the ſtricteſt ſenſe he can imagine: ſo that both are with him compatible. Thus we ſee in withſtanding the truth, hee is ſtill in the briers of Contradictiones.

The *Doubter* excepts againſt his reaſon [That philip might be both a deacon and Evangiliſt] To which he anſwers [*That by the ſame Reaſon Timothie and Titus might be both Biſhops and Evangeliſts*] I anſwer 1. We have ſhowen already, That philip ceaſed to be a deacon at Jeruſalem when he became ane Evangeliſt. 2. Suppoſing he were

both

yet the *Informers* anſwer and parallel, is naught. For P. Philipes becoming ane Evangeliſt was ane advancement to a higher office, holding ſtill ane inferiour, which is eminenter included in it, as he will grant, but making ane Evangeliſt a Biſhop is a degrading of a high extraordinary ſuperiour officer, to ane ordinary inferiour.

2. As ane Evangiliſt properly ſo called, his work was to preach and ſpread the goſpel unfixedly, as a Biſhop, his work he will ſay, was ordination and juriſdiction, which Two we heard him affirme to be incompatible.

Beſides, in ſeparating the power of ordination and juriſdiction, from the Evangeliſtick office, he is contradicted by *Saravia*, who in many places mantaines the contrary (de grad: cap. 1. — and Cap. 16 and cap. 23) And here I ſhall ſhew our *Informer* how he hath run croſs to his great Maſter in his gloſſes upon ſeveral of theſe Texts under debate, that it may appear, what babel-like builders our prelates Advocates are.

Upon that paſſage (Matth. 20) I finde he is a little more ingenuous then this is Diſciple, and plainely ſpeakes out what he but mutters (*exam: tract: de epiſc: tripl: queſt: 1. pag: 70.* after he hath repeated that Text with its parallel in Luke, he adds. *Ex his verbis quæro num cuiquam ſano videri poſſit D. Jeſum ſuſtuliſſe aut prohibuiſſe primatum aut principatum? & non potius docuiſſe quid eum deceat, qui in Eccleſia primus & princeps futurus erat &c* that is, *From theſe Wordes I demand whither any that is ſound can judge, that the Lord Jeſus did take away primaci and principality, and did not rather teach what becomes him, who was to be firſt and Prince in the Church* — and thereafter he tells us that Chriſt by his own example did ſhew what ſort of *primaci* it is that the allowes in his Church, ſo that he doth in downright expreſs terms plead for a ſupreme patriarch or pope repreſenting Chriſts pritcipality over the Church, & what harmony this keeps with the judgment of proteſtant divines upon that paſſage, any may judge. The *Informers*

„holdes „That there was to be no inequality of po-„wer among the 12 Apostles (although he is not con-sistent with himself in this, as is already observed) but *Saravia* runs so far cross to him in this assertion that he mantaines *a primaci of power* among them.

That the *Bishops*, saluted with the deacons, (Phil: 1.) were *meer Presbyters*, he is forced to acknowledge, „and so condemnes our *Informers* shifts, about „Ex-„traneus Bishops accidently there, or with the Apo-„stle himself, or that the Diocesian is included in „the word [Bishop] — *in epistola ad Philippenses salu-tem dicit Episcopis & diaconis, unde quemadmodum intelligi-tur Philippensium ecclesiam habuisse Presbyteros & diaconos &c.* „(de Grad: Cap: 8.) „In the Epistle to the Philippi-„ans Paul salutes the Bishops and deacones, hence „as we are given to understand, that the Church of the „Philippians had Presbyters and Deacons. &c. Again, the *Informer* layes aside the Highpreist, as a type of Christ, when he pleads for prelacie from the Jewish Church-government. But in this *Saravia* gives him the lie fort. He holds the inferiour priests to have been in there administration types of Christ as well as the high priest. And 2. That the Government, whether of the inferiour or highpriests, is not abolished as typi-cal (*de honor: præs: & prysb: deb: cap:* 10, *& de Diverf: grad Ministr: cap* 14.) Besides, the *Informer* holds that that place 2 Tim. 2: 4. Commandes Churchmen to be as „Abstract as possible from publik civil imployments, „and not intangle themselves therein. But *Saravia* ad-stricts *the affairs of this life* spoken of in that Scripture, un-to *the endeavours which belonges to the nourishment and man-tainance of this life*, and holds that it doth not at all speak of nor discharge Churchmens *holding of publick state im-ployments under Princes.* He minces not the matter as this man. *Vitæ negotia* (saith he] *sunt ea quibus „quæ ad hujus vitæ victum pertinent, comparantur, non quæ sunt*

*prin-*

*principis aut civitatis publica.* And [ *de hon: præſul. & Preſèit: deb:* ] he præfixes this title unto. Cap: 26. As that which he undertakes to prove—— *Idem Homo tanquam epiſcopus curam eccleſiæ Domino Jeſu, & fidem ac obſequium regi tanquam ipſius beneficiarius reddere poteſt.* „ That the ſame man may perform his duety to Chriſt as a Biſhop, and attend the Church, and alſo render faith and obedience to the King as his vaſſal &c.

The *doubter* nixt excepts to better purpoſe „ That „ they could not be Biſhops, becauſe they were not „ ſettled at theſe places, eſpecially Timothy, had he „ been Biſhop at Epheſus, he had been fixed to his „ charge, but he was left only there upon occaſional „ imployment, and for a ſeaſon, 1 Tim. 1: 3. To this „ he anſwers 1. That they were rare and ſingular per- „ ſons uſefull for the Apoſtle at that time, and there- „ fore it is no wonder that they were called from their „ particular charge when the Churches good required „ it. Philip. 2: 19, 20 2 Cor. 8: 23. As with us a Mi- „ niſter may be called from his charge for a ſeaſon „ when the good of the Church elſe where requires it. To which I rejoyne 1. This anſwer ſuppoſes the thing in Queſtion (viz) [ That Timothie and Titus were once fixed as Biſhops in theſe Churches ] But the ground of the exception is, That becauſe their occaſionall tranſient Imployment in theſe places, is ſo clear & expreſſe, there- for they were never fixed to theſe Churches as their par- ticular charge, but had it for their charge to water all the Churches which the Apoſtles planted, and attend their planetarie motion from Church to Church. So that they cannot be in their worke and duty paralleled to a Paſtours tranſient Imployment from his particular char- ge for the Churches greater good, whoſe *fixed charge* is ſuppoſed. But we have proved that Timothie and Ti- tus their ordinarie Imployment was this *tranſient and unfixed Miniſtery*: which is clearly holden out in ſcriptur

both

both befor and after their officiating in these Churches. 2, It is also cleared above, that as the scripture is utterly silent of their return to these Churches againe, after Pauls recaling them from the same, and after their transient Imployment therein: So we have made it likewayes appear, that they did officiat thereafter in many other Churches, performing to them the same duties of Evangelists as in Ephesus and crete. And that in Ephesus, elders were called Bishops, and had the whole Episcopal charge before Timothie, committed to them in paules last farewell. In a word, it can never be made good that any who were fixed to particular charges, did so travell up and down as these Evangilists are proved to ,, have done. Againe he tells us ,, That *Gerard* thinks ,, they were first Evangelists, then made Bishops by ,, Paul at Ephesus and Crete. Ans. If he think so too, he must quite all his plea for their Episcopacie from these Epistles: for Paul calls Timothy *to doe the worke of ane Evangelist* here, and Titus worke was the same: And he must understand this in the strict sense (if he offer *Gerards* exception to any purpose) which, according to him, secludes power in ordination and jurisdiction. So that a worke and office being enjoyned Timothy in this Epistle, which hath nothing to doe with ordination and iurisdiction, he was not yet made a Bishop, and if not yet, it will be hard to find out his commission and patent afterward in scripture, since he was in perpetual evangilistick Imployments, and sure if Paul ever designed him Bishop over Ephesus, he would not have called the elders of Ephesus, Bishopes, befor Timothy ,, in his last farewell. We heard *Saravia* plead ,, that ,, Paul intitles not Timothy an *Evangelist* [*non compellat nomine Evangelistæ*] how *did he not* see that [that Paul, *numquam compellat nomine episcopi*, never puts upon Timothy or Titus, the title or name *of a Bishope*, neither in the inscriptiones of the epistles

Epistles writen to them, nor in any place of these Epistles, or else where in scripture, nor injoynes any of them *to do the work of Bishop*. As he injoynes one of them expresly *to do the work of ane Evangelist*. And since the Apostle, *disertis verbis*. in tities these *elders* of Ephesus, *Bishops*, and (to use *Saravia's* phrase) compellat nomine Episcoporum, and that with the signal emphasis; *of being made Bishops by the Holy Ghost*, his reason from epithets and compellations, will the more strongely evinc them to be such. 2. This is a great degrading of ane Evangelist, and derogatorie to his high function, to make him a *Bishop*. The Councel of Chaldecon judges it sacrilegious to degrade a Bishop to a Presbyter, such must he acknowledge this degrading to be, and therefore that being once Evangelists, of necessity they behoved to continue so. Next, the *Doubter* objects, what we have been saying, „ that Paul gave to the elders of Ephesus „ the Charge, not to Timothy, which he would not „ have done, had he been *Bishop*, since it is proba- „ ble he was present at this time, for v. 4. He was in Pauls companie. Here he gingerly nibbles at this Argument least it prick him, omitting these pregnant circumstances of the context. 1. That this was Pauls last and farewell exhortation. 2. That he not only gives these elders the Charge over that Church before Timothy, and not to him, but also *the whole Episcopal charge*, ποιμαινειν, to feed and rule as the Holy Ghosts Bishops set over the same, which comprehends both ordination and jurisdiction. But what sayes he to this Argument. 1: *It may be he was not yet settled Bishop as Gerard thinks*. But sure he had all the settlement as Bishop which the first Epistle afoords him, from which this man derives his Episcopacy, and power in ordination and jurisdiction: and if, for all these, our *Informer* will grant that he might have been not as yet Bishop, but ane Evangelist. Then 1. he must

acknowledge that all his pleading for his Episcopac
in the nixt pages, from the power he is supposed t
have in the first epistle, is but a beating of the aire an
impertinent, since it might be Antecedaneous to h
Episcopacie: and by the *Informers* confession, he migl
have had yet no more Episcopal relation to th
Church, then any who was never Bishop there. Henc
2. Not being yet Bishop, but ane Evangelist still, (a
*Gerard* takes him) in a traveling posture up and down
with the Apostle (as also *Bishop Hall*, *Downam and Hoo*
*ker* acknowledge him) I wonder how this man wil
sustean his denyal, *that he was ane Evangelist in the proper*
*and strict sense*, such as his was. Sure, if this his suppositi
on, or [*may be*] will hold good, timothies office, as suc
ane Evangelist, *was to cease in the Church*, as he expresseth
it, and Pauls bidding him *doe the work of ane Evangelist*
sufficiently Unbishops him at least pro tunc, which
notwithstanding we heard him deny. 2. He tell
us] ,,that *Irenæus* who lived not long after the Apostles
,, thinks there were Asian Bishops mingled with the el-
,,ders of Ephesus, and with Timothie their Bishop
,,to whom in common Paul made that exhortation
,,comprehending the [Bishops] under the name of [el-
,,ders] as Apostles were sometymes called] *Ans.*
We may be much in love with this scripture in the pre-
sent debate, since it forces adversaries upon such sim-
ple incoherent shifts. First, *it may be he was not yet made*
*Bishop* ——— then least that concession prove too grip-
ping, there must be *other Bishops of Asia*, *mingled with*
*these elders*, and Timothie of necessitie must be now
Bishop, or hardly well after, and their own Bishop
and the extraneous ones, must be all shuffled up unde
the name of *elders*, and *exhorted in common*, a
he shifts the argument from Philip. 1. But th
text it self sufficiently discovers the folly of this poo
shift. For 1. Paul called the elders *from Ephesus*, an
th

the elders *of the Church there*, not imaginary elders or Bishops from other places. 2 He sent for *the elders of the Church*, in the singular number, not *of the Churches*, and so all he sent for had a particular relation *to that Church*, for had there been elders of other Churches there, It would have been expressed *elders of the Churches*: If other elders or Bishops of Asia had been there, they would have receaved the Scripture denomination of provincial Churches, which are expressed in the plural. So we read of *Churches of Asia*, Revel. 1: 11. *Churches of Judea* Gal. 1: 22. *Next*, This answer still supposes [*The existence of the diocesian Bishop over Presbyters at that time*] which is a poor begging of the question. Wee prove from this, and such like texts, that the Bishops of Asia, and Ephesus were meer Pastours, who had in Common the Epicopal charge over the Church, and that the Holy Ghost set up these, and none else. *In fine*, This is but a meer shift in the Iudgment of *Chrysostom*, *Hierom*, *Theodoret*, and the Current of Interpreters, who take these *elders* for *meer Presbyters*, and is contrare to the *Syriack* translation, which reads it, *Presbyteros ecclesiæ Ephesinæ*. So the *Concilium Aquisgravense*.

But now comes his proofe of Timothie, and Titus, their Episcopacie from these Epistles. His first Reason in general, is. *That in these Epistles more fully then any where else in the new Testament, Paul gives direction to Timothie and Titus how to carry in ordination and jurisdiction, which Two comprehends the Episcopall office.* *Ans.* 1. With him there is a possibilitie, or *may be*, that for all these directions, Timothy and Titus were evangelists still, *and not yet Bishops*; and so these directions might be given to them as extraordinary officers, who, according to him, *were to cease*, and consequently though comprehensive of the Episcopal office, yet the office might cease with their persons as exercised in that manner, and the power of ordination

and juriſdiction be deryved to different recipients, to be exerciſed in another maner, (viz) by preſbyters in common. 2. By what conſequence will he infer ane Epiſcopall authority and inſpection, from *the Apoſtles preſcribing rules to them anent ordination and juriſdiction*? May not all Miniſters be herin directed, as well as Timothy and Titus? or will his giving directions to them in this poynt infer their ſole and ſingular authority therein? Surely not at all in Churches conſtitute: and as for what they did in the frameing and conſtitution of Churches yet *in fieri*, as to their organick being, is not to the purpoſe. 3. We did ſhew above that the prelats power, and their way as to ordination and juriſdiction, is *in its very nature*, different from that which either Apoſtle or Evangeliſt exerciſed, as being a *dominion* and arbitrary power, yea including in it *a civil dominion*, and derived from the civil Magiſtrat. None of which can be ſaid of any authority which Timothy and Titus are here ſuppoſed to have: In a word, as it is clear that the elders of Epheſus, at Paul's laſt farewell, were intruſted with the whole power of ordination, and juriſdiction, and as the Epiſcopi were commanded ποιμαινειν, to feed and rule with out any reſpect to Timothy: which clearly demonſtrats that he (and conſequenly Titus) had no Epiſcopal power of ordination and juriſdiction, over theſe Churches, eſtabliſhed in their perſons, by any preſcriptions here delivered; So it is as evident that the ſame preſcriptions might be delivered to *any Moderator of a Synod*, or vnto a tranſiently viſiting Miniſter, though even in relation to a province, which being neceſſarly to be underſtod *Salvo jure Eccleſiæ*, would import no Epiſcopall or ſole authority, and thus the caſe is here.

But what were theſe directions importing this power? He inſtances 1. [*In the qualifications which they muſt require in ſuch as were to be ordained-not ſuddenly to lay on hands, which reſpects ordination. next, the rules anent government, how to rebuke*

*buke offenders, not to receave ane accuſation, but before two or three witneſſes, how to deal with heretikes, &c. Anſ.* 1. Theſe Apoſtolik directions in point of Government, are good & excellent, but how doth he prove that the *adreſſing of* theſe directions, *to Timothie*, will infer his *Sole* and *ſingle authority* in all theſe, ſo as to ſeclude Presbyters from their ſhare therein? And if he prove not this, it will ſay nothing to evince ane *Epiſcopal authority*. What if ſuch directions were adreſſed to a Moderator? would that infer his Authoritie over the Synod? Nay, ſince a Presbytry laid on hand's upon Timothy himſelf, Since the Presbyters of this Church of Epheſus, had the Epiſcopal power in Common, committed to them as the Holy Ghoſts Biſhops, Since the Corinth-Preſbytery did excommunicat the inceſtuous, we may clearly infer, that theſe directions, though immediatly addreſſed to Timothy, yet belonged to Presbyters of that and Other Churches, as well as him. 2. Suppoſing that this adreſſ will give him a ſpeciall Intereſt herein, yet how will the *Informer* prove that it reſpects Timothy any other way, and in any other Capacity, then of *ane Euangeliſt*, which he ſayes it might be, he yet was, and not a Biſhop? He diſſallowes not of *Gerards* opinion, who ſayes, *that he was not yet made Biſhop*; Now, if theſe Rules were to be obſerved by him, and this his ſuppoſed ſingular Authority exerciſed [*as ane Evangeliſt, whoſe office was to ceaſe*,] It will plead nothing for the Epiſcopall power. Surely upon our ſuppoſition, that he was a fellow-helper and aſſiſtant of Paul, in his Apoſtolik function, and had a tranſient occaſional Imployment here, as is clearely held out in the Text, theſe rules are very ſuitable unto him in that capacity. Beſids, theſe Directions are for inſtruction of *every man of God*, or Miniſter, in point of Church-Government 2. Tim. 3: 16. 1 Tim. 4. 6: But doth not give them Epiſopal power. Or will he ſay that every man hath

hath the formal office, or place, in the nature whereof he is instructed? The dedication of a book to a man anent rules of kingly Government will not make the man, or suppose him, either King or Governour.

In the 3d. place. As to these Directions themselves, particularly as to Timothies direction, as to laying on of hands, 'tis Answered, that *laying on of hands* in ordination, is found in Scripture *a Presbyterial Act* competent to meer Presbyters, which (as I said) they exercised upon Timothy himself, though Paul was present, 1 Tim 4: 14. 2 Tim. 1, 5. And therefor Timothy could have *no single, or Episcopal authority therein* in Churches Constitute So that the precept directs Presbyters as well as him in that point. Nay, this addressed direction mainly respected them, as the *proper subject* of this power, and the Presbytery received their lesson here (*not to lay on hands suddenly*) rather then Timothy. Nixt, As for *his Authority and directions anent rebuking and Censures. I answ.* That neither can this be Timothy's sole prerogative, for either it is meaned of *a Privat rebuke*, and this „ every Christian hath authority in: „ Thou shalt in any „ wise rebuke thy neighbour, and not suffer sin upon „ him. Levit. 19: 17. Prov. 9: 8. Or of *a ministerial rebuke*: and this is competent to every Minister of the word. Isa. 58: 1. 2 Tim. 4 1, 2. Tit. 1: 13. 2; Sam. 12: 8. And besides, Institutions and reproofs of Church officers, will not prove a fixed Episcopal power. Prophets rebuked, but had no jurisdiction over Priests, nor Paul over Peter, though he reproved him. As for that which he particularly mentions about *receiving ane accusation against ane Elder*, It is answered, That this also belongs to the *official juridical power of Elders*, since Ruling & Government attribute to them in Scripture, doth necessarily import ane authority to receive accusations, and correct delinquents by reproofs and censures, Matth. 8: 16. 17. There is ane accusation to be delated

lated *ecclesiæ, to the Church*, or the juridical Court, not to one Prelat, as is above cleared; and therefore the direction anent *the receiving of the accusation*, respects them who were *to judge upon it*, and not the Prelat. Compare this with 1 Cor. 5: 4, 5. The Presbyters must *meet together* to rebuke the Incestuous *there* and they that are *Spiritual* must restore the delinquent, Gal. 6: 1. The Church officers, *or Ministers* of Thessalonica must *note* and *admonish* authoritatively the disobedient Brother, 2 Thess. 3: 14, 15. To which I may add, that as upon the one hand Timothy is forbidden *to rebuke ane elder*, and positively enjoyned [*doubly to honour them, when faithful*] So, the *receiving ane accusation*, is no more then that which every privat Christian and Minister is capable of, even against the superiour, whither in state, or age, in relation to admonition, Counsel or Comfort accordingly. Levit. 19: 17. Gal. 6: 1, 2 Joh. 10, 11. None in whatever capacity are exeemed from this precept, not to receive accusations lightly. Hence the 4th. Council of *Carthage* (cited by *Blond. Apol. Sect.* 4) enacted *That no Bishop should hear ane accusation without the Clergie, and that without their assent, the sentence should be voyd.* where was *the negative voyce* here. *Whittaker*, thus answers the Popish pleading upon this text, and our *Informers* too (controv. 4. Quest. 1. Cap. 2.) „That „Timothy is commanded not rashly to receive ane ac„cusation, proves not that he had dominion over El„ders, which according to the Apostles minde is to „bring a crime to the Church, to bring the guilty „into judgement, openly to reprove, which not only „superiors may doe, but also equals and inferiors. In „the Roman Republick, the Kings did not only judge „the people, but also the Senators and *patricii*; and „certainly it seems not that Timothy had such a Con„sistory and Court as was afterward appointed to Bi„shops in the Church, what this authority was may be

„ understood by that which followes, [those that sin re-
„ buke before all], which equals also may doe.
„ Thus Bishops heretofore, if any elder or Bishop had
„ ane ill report, referred it to the ecclesiastick Senat or,
„ Synod, and condemned him if he seemed worthy,
„ by a publick judgement, that is, did either suspend,
„ excommunicat, or remove him, the Bishop condem-
„ neing nocent elders or deacons, *not by his authority a-*
„ *lone*, but with the judgment of the Church and clergie
„ — & in case of appeals, even to the Metropolitan, *he could doe nothing without the Synod & what they did was ratified.* The same is the answer of *Bucer de vi & usu, Sacr. Minister: Willet Sinops. Papist Contr.* 5, *Ques.* 3 *part* 3, *In the appendix Bucer. de Gub.* pag. 300. to 398.

The *Informer* tells us in the next place that „ these
„ directions concern after ages and are of ordinary use:
„ and therefore they cannot be extraordinary officers
„ in these Acts —— that in calling Timothy and
„ Titus, extraordinary officers in these Acts, we lead
„ the way to their errour, who call ordination and juris-
„ diction, extraordinary. *Answ.* As we have proved, that none of these directions will infer in Timothy ane Episcopal Power properly such, but that any power he had above Presbyters, was *by his special Evangelistick Legation*, so the concernment of after ages in these directions, and their being of *constant use*, is a pitiful argument to prove the continuanc of the power in that manner. Are not all the old Testament precepts anent the antiquated ceremonies, all the acts & directions given to extraordinary officers, both under the Old and New Testament, *of perpetual use in after ages?* But are they therefore to be *imitated* and retained? What will he say to the Papists, pleading for the anoin-
[illegible]g of the sick upon the Apostle James his precept [*let the elders anoint the sicke with oile, and pray*] this is ane Act enjoyned to ordinary officers, viz, to el-
ders,

ders, and joyned with with prayer, a conſtant ſtanding dutie: and he will not ſay that this Apoſtolick precept is to be expunged as uſeles. What? muſt we therefore retean anointing? would he not in this caſe diſtinguiſh betwixt that which is *a conſtant dutie, and a temporarie concomitant* and appendix. Acted not the Apoſtles extraordinarely in their very preaching, both as to its extent, its confirmation by miracles, their gifts of tongues, and are not the Acts of preaching and baptizing of conſtant uſe in the Church? Muſt not this *Informer* grant that theſe *Apoſtolick Acts* of preaching and baptizing are perpetual, though the mould and *maner* is extraordinary and gone, in ſo far as their extraordinary Apoſtolick power interpoſed therein. Thus the Acts of ordination and juriſdiction are moral, but the *modus rei*, is extraordinary, in ſo farr as their Evangeliſtik authority, and ſpecial legation, interpoſed therein. He muſt either acquieſc in this, and acknowledge this his argueing *Sophiſtick* and pueril, or he will contradict what he ſaid before, anent the Apoſtles extraordinary Priviledges, which are gone with them, viz, infaillibilitie, their immediat call, ſending to all nations, *and what elſe was neceſſary for the firſt founding of the Church!* Now, is not that which was thus neceſſary, *of perpetual uſe*? Are we not built upon the foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets? Are not the ordinances and Miniſtery receaved from them, of perpetuall uſe? And their moſt extraordinary Acts, if we mean it *of improvement*. Nay, did not the new-Teſtament Church receave the Law of God, and ordinances from the Jewes? Muſt we therefore Judaize? 2. How will he prove that the aſſerting, that any officer hath ane extraordinary authority converſant about ſuch ane Act, will give groundto ſay, that *the Act it ſelf is extraordinary, or the ordinance touched by that Act, expyred*? Will his aſſerting, that the Apoſtles exerciſed ane extraor-

dinary authority which is now ceased, in their preaching unfixedly, by ane immediat call, and confirming their doctrine with miracles, and strange tongues, give ground to conclude *that the ordinances of preaching and baptizing are expired also*? I trow he will not grant this. How then will our asserting, that Timothy and Titus put forth ane extraordinary Evangelistick authority in ordination, and jurisdiction infer, *that the Acts of ordination and jurisdiction, or these ordinances themselves, are expired*? can he not distinguish betwixt the *power it self*, and the *different subject, and manner of its exercise*, ordinary or extraordinary? can he not see in Scripture *ane extraordinary power* derived, and cut out in a succession of *different and ordinary channels, and diverslie exercised*? Sayes he not that the Apostles had ane extraordinary power, of both ordination and jurisdiction, and both the keyes. But I trow he asserts that, there are different recipients, who bring down ane ordinary power by succession. Some (Prelats forsooth), have the key of Governmant, others (viz,) Presbyters, have preaching for their work, but no rule properly. And sayes he not that the *extensive authority*, in which the Apostles exercised their Ministry, is gone, and *a limited ordinary Ministry* derived from them. If the extraordinary Mission of twelve Apostles, hath derived from it a Ministery and ecclesiastick authority spread throw all Church-officers in the world, who succeed them not into *the same office*, let this *Informer* shew me, why may not Timothies Evangelistick extraordinary power in ordination and jurisdiction, be deryved by, and seatted, in a Presbytery, though the *Evangelistick Office* is extraordinary, and (as such) not succeeded unto. The service, and worke of teaching, and governing to continue in all times, doth not render the Apostolick mission or commission, ordinarie, nor infer their being succeded *in idem officium, & eundem gradum*, the ordinary

ordinary power being institut and settled in the hands of ordinary officers, by a new warrand and commission, according to the Scripture rules of ordination. The office of Moses was not rendered ordinary, because many works of Government exercised by him, were recommitted to the Elders of Israel; and so the case is here. The Evangelists extraordinary office and commission (necessary, as that of the Apostles, for the first founding of the Churches, and watering and building them up in their organick being, & for settling all their ordinary officers) is changed into the Presbytery their ordinary Collegiat power of ordination & jurisdiction; which we find was in the Apostolick Churches exercised, and even in this of Ephesus.

His 2d Reason to prove them Bishops, is, *Because their commission at Ephesus & Crete, was not voyded upon the first settling of Ministers in those places, therefore their office was to be constant, since if meerly as Evangelists they were to settle a Church there, then they were to give place to the Presbytery when some Ministers were ordained: but they did not so:* —— *Titus needed not ordain Elders in every city, if some few ordained might ordain the rest.* Ans. 1. This is a poor „ argument, and hath no twist of a connexion [„ their „ commission at these places was not voyded upon the „ first settleing of Ministers,] ergo, [they were not ex- „ traordinary officers, but had a standing Episcopacie „ there] which is a meer rope of sand. The Apostles office and commission was not voyded over all Churches when settled, Ergo, they had no extraordinary inspection, office, or commission towards all these Churches. What consequence is here? So may it be said of these Vicarious Apostles, their commission to these or other Churches could not be voided or expired, though they were never so much settled, but they were *pro re nata* to visite and water all the Churches, and bring Apostolick instructions to them, and reports from them anent their

their caſe. We have proved that Timothie and Titus exerciſed their extraordinary office, and commiſſion, towards many other Churches, after their return from theſe of Epheſus, & Crete, ſo that their commiſſion towards theſe or other Churches, could be no more voided whil the Apoſtles Imployed them therin, then their office. Beſid, this *Informer* ſhould advert, that Timothy is left *To charge ſome that they teach no other doctrine* which was a commiſſion beyond the meer ſettling of Miniſters, and ſuppoſing ſome already ſettled. 2. Will he ſay that Timothy and Titus were ordinary ſtanding officers or Biſhops, over theſe ſeverall Churches, where they might reſide ſome time, and have Imployment therin, even after they had officers of their own? did they not viſite and water many other Churches, were they therefore their Biſhops? if ſo, he muſt quickly tranſport them to be Biſhops of other Churches, after they were Biſhops here: & exalt them to metropolitans as ſome of the ancients make them. 3. *Their Evangeliſtik inſpection*, direction, and aſſiſtence, even after ſome ordinary officers were ſettled, could no more prejudge *the ordinary power and authority of theſe officers*, then the Apoſtles extraordinary inſpection, and infallible univerſal directive power, could prejudge the Churches ordinary authority, in ordination and juriſdiction. The Apoſtles power (which could not be voyded, nor expyre, whil they were alive) being *Cumulative unto*, but not *privative of*, the Churches ordinary power, ſo it is here. I would ask our *Informer*, was Pauls apoſtolick commiſſion to Crete and Epheſus, voyded, after *Biſhops* were ſet up there? Nay, he will not ſay it. But did this Null the Epiſcopall power of Timothy and Titus, over theſe Churches? I trow not. Well, no more could Timothys extraordinary inſpection make voyd the ordinary power of presbyters. 4. We told him already that how long ſoever Timothy and Titus were reſident there, they were to doe nothing pro imperio,

and

and were not to lord it over the presbyters. 5. Although elders once ordained, have power to ordaine others, yet the *bene eſſe*, did call for the Inſpection and direction of ſuch highely gifted and extraordinary officers herein, as theſe were. And Moreover, in that Infant-ſtate of the Church, Apoſtolick precepts and rules in reference to Church government, and the exerciſe of both the keyes, were to be delivered by theſe extraordinary officers, & conſequently might call for, & protract their continuanc therein, even after ordinary officers were ordained. *In fine.* He cannot deny but that the Apoſtle recalled both Timothy and Titus from theſe places, to the further proſecution of their employment in other Churches, and that their tranſient imployment therein is held out, after their return from Epheſus and Cret; as likwayes their occaſionall employment in both theſe places, which will *in ſo farr voyd their commiſſion* in relation to them, as clearly to refut the ſuppoſed epiſcopal ordinary charge which he alledges they exerciſed. Next, from the Authores of *jus divinum Miniſt: evangel:* [concluding againſt the peoples power of ordination, upon Timothy and Titus being left at theſe places to ordaine elders] The *Informer* inferrs againſt them thus, *why was Timothy or Titus left to ordaine elders, after ſome were ordained by Paul, If Miniſters ſo ordained could ordaine the reſt? and after ſome were ordained by Timothy and Titus, they were left ſtill upon that imployment.* I anſwer. his inference touches not theſe Reverend authors in the leaſt. The ordaineing of elders in relation to the *beue eſſe*, even after ſome elders were there, and the furder directing and compleating of theſe Churches in their members and officers, did require ane Evangeliſtick inſpection, though the *ordinarie power of ordaineing*, remained with the ordinary elders and Church officers, as the ſcripture doth clearly hold out. Paul haveing after committed to the elders of this Church of Epheſus the whol power of

government

government. But the ſcripture gives not the leaſt hint *of the peoples power to ordaine*, but attributes this ſtill to Church officers as proper to them. So that this Inference ſtands good in the generall [though ſome were converted to Chriſtianity there, yet they could not ordaine officers, but Church officers were ſent upon that Imployment] ergo. *Church officers muſt ordaine, and not the people:* but the ſpeciall inference will not hold, *ergo, Biohops muſt only ordaine* for the reaſons already given, no more then from Paules ordaining the firſt elders, it will follow [*ergo Paul, or ane Apoſtle only, muſt ordaine*] which is a Conſequence our *Informer* dare not admitt, elſe he will contradict himſelf. It is a good conſequence [Paul, *a Church officer*, preached and baptized] ergo [none but Church officers muſt preach and baptize] but [ergo, none but *ane Apoſtle* muſt preach and baptize] is bad logick. So his inference is neither logicall nor theological.

His 3d. Reaſon to prove Timothy a Biſhop, is taken from *Pauls ſolemne Charge* 1. *Tim.* 6. 13. *to keep what he had commanded him, till the appearing of Ieſus Chriſt. That presbyterians* (particularly, ius divinum Miniſt. pag. 74.) *hold theſe Directions to be for all ages of the Church, making them paralleel with* Matth. 28. 20. *anent Chriſts promiſed preſence to the end and* 1: *Tim.* 5. 7, 21. *Anent Pauls Charge to obſerve theſe things.* Whence he concludes *that they were to have ſucceſſors in their office, and were not extraordinary officers, ſince theſe divines ſay, page* 160. [*That Apoſtolick examples in things neceſſary for the good of the Church, and which cary a perpetuall equity and reaſon in them, have the force of a rule*] *and the Apoſtles ſetting Timothy and Titus over theſe Churches, is ane example Apoſtolick for the good of the Church, and hath a perpetuall reaſon and equitie in it.* *Anſ.* 1. Wee have made it appear that no directions given to Timothy will amount to demonſtrat any epiſcopall dominion over this Church, and that he had no ſole or arbitrary power either

either in ordination or juriſdiction,& conſequently that the *charge of* [keeping that which was commanded him] will Import & inferr no keeping of ane *Epiſcopall charge.* 2. Wee have alſo ſhewed what a bad conſequence it is, to argue from the perpetual uſe of precepts or directions, given to extraordinary officers, in relation to extraordinary acts, towards *the Churches imitating of theſe acts, and retaineing theſe expired functions*, which is palpably a non-ſequitur, as this man can not deny, elſe he will ſwallow horrid abſurdities. Every thing which is for our *conſtant uſe* and Improvement, is not likwayes for *our Imitation.* Againe, 3. I would ask this *Informer*, if the Command 1. Tim. 6. 13. joyned with the promiſe Matth. 28. 20. Will not reach and include every peece of the Apoſtolik and evangeliſtik office? Sure he cannot deny this, and yet he acknowledges there were ſeverall peeces of their work temporary and expyred. Will he dare to ſay that what the apoſtle commanded Timothy in this Epiſtle, was confined within Epheſus, or reached him only as overſieing that Church, and not in relation to his Evangiliſtick office throw all the Churches? and that the promiſe Matth. 28. did not reach the moſt extraordinary Apoſtolick Acts; So that himſelf muſt diſtinguiſh (unleſs he be inconſiſtent with himſelf) betwixt what is moral, and extraordinary, in this command and charge, and accordingly reached by the promiſe. 4. His citation from the *Ius divin. Miniſt:* & c Cuts the throate of his cauſe: for argueing thus againſt privat perſons intrudeing into the miniſtry [That the ſcripture layes down rules for calling men to that office] they inſtance in the qualifications of the perſon, Citeing 1. Tim. 3. 2, 3. anent the properties of the ſcripture Biſhop or presbyter. „Then they add [ That the Scripture directs as to the „maner of his calling, viz, who are to ordaine, how hee „is to be ordained, citeing 1. Tim. 4. 14. viz, that „the presbytery is to ordaine, and ordaine by the laying

ing

ing on of hands —— adding, that these directions are for all ages, and citeing 1 Tim. 6: 13, 14.] Now, if these *perpetuall directions for all ages*, be touching no other Bishops but these in 1 Tim. 3: 1. And anent ordination by the hands of the Presbytery, surely those are *Presbyterial* not *Episcopal* directions, and doe palpably exclude Timothy's standing Episcopacy; So that he did not well to raise this Ghost. Next, ane *Apostolical example for the good of the Church*, is not that which they hold to have the force of a rule, as the *Informer* belies them but ane example *in things necessary for the good of the Church*. And as this, so the next citation out of that book, burnes his fingers. For the *authores* having cited. 2. Tim. 2: 2, In order to their scope of pleading for ordination as a perpetuall standing ordinance, Timothy being in that place enjoyned to commit those things which he had heard from Paul, to faithfull men who shall be able to teach others. They infer. 1. A necessity of setting apart some to be teachers in Christs Church. 2. The qualifications of such, viz, they must be faithfull men, and able to teach. 3. That Timothy is enjoyned to committ what he had heard to faithful men, which they understand of ordination of ministers, that there might be a perpetuall succession of teachers. And comparing it with the former citation, it appears that they hold these precepts to import the derivation of the ordinary power of teaching and Government to ordinary Ministers. And when the Anti-Ministeriall party object [ that these are *but examples*, which doe not amount to make up *a rule*] they give this answer [ that Apostolick examples in things necessary for the Church, and which have a perpetuall reason and equity in them, have the force of a rule] now, this example is anent the committing of are ordinary power of ordination, and jurisdiction, to faithfull Ministers and teachers, which quit justles out the prelatical power. For since they hold Timothy's singular way

way in this, as ane Evangeliſt, was to ceaſe (which they muſt needs doe upon the forementioned ground, the Presbyterial, and the ſingular power being inconſiſtent in the ſame ſubiect) they muſt needs place *this Evangeliſtick power among theſe examples which doe not obleidge*, and it is ordination it ſelf, and its continuance in this manner by ordinary teachers which they expreſly plead for, as the Apoſtolick example, which hath a perpetual reaſon and equity, and the force of a rule; not Timothies ſingular power herin which they hold to be expired. So that the *Informers* aſſumption viz; *That Timothies Evangeliſtick Inſpection by the Apoſtles apointment over this Church, as alſo that of Titus, is ſuch ane exemple, as hath a perpetuall reaſon and equity in it* He might have found to be rejected by theſe divines (had he read that peece attentivly) as no way following from (yea contrare unto) their aſſertion and it is ſtill left at his door to prove and make good.

His Laſt Reaſon, to prove the Epiſcopacy of Timothy and Titus, is taken from Teſtimonies. *That Polycrates and Euſebius affirme Timothy to have been Biſhop of Epheſus. — That Leontius Biſh: of Magneſia in the generall Council of Calcedon Act* 11. *points out a ſeries of Tuentie Seven Biſhops in Epheſus, from Timothy &c: Anſ:* Since the ſcriptures doe clearly hold out his extraordinary Evangeliſtick function, and there is nothing therein which can in the leaſt infer his having ane *ordinary epiſcopall power*, The Informers pleading upon this head being found frivolous and leaning upon that known fallacy viz, to argue from [The ſingularity of ane extraordinary officer] to the [Singularity of ane ordinary perpetuall officer] in Churchgovernment which will as well ſet up (upon the ground of the Apoſtles univerſall inſpection) patriarchs, or popes as prelats: Surely the improper ſtyles and deſignations which the Ancients put upon Timothy or Titus, who ſpoke in the language of their owne times, is a very inſignificant proof to Counter ballance

Scripture light in this mater. *Tertullians* saying (cited by park. l 2. C, 7.) is here remarkable, *Si constat id verius quod prius, id prius quod ab initio, id ab initio quod ab Apostolis &c: that is trueſt which is firſt that is firſt which is from the beginning, that is from the beginning which is from the Apoſtles.* Their opinions who call them Biſhops, are for moſt part borrowed from *Euſebius*, of whoſe hallucinations *Scaliger* gives large prooſes, and yet all that he ſayes is ἰσοπίζει It is reported; and this report he had from a fabulus *Clemens*. The ancients likewayes call the Apoſtles themſelves Biſhops, peter of Rome, James of Jeruſalem. Yea Theodoret Calls Timothy and Titus *Apoſtles of Aſia and crete*, which the *Informer* will not juſtifie. Yea ſome call them Motropolitanes, Arch-Biſhops, patriarchs, and this becauſe (ſaith *Walo Meſſalinus*) they did theſe Acts which afterward by human Cuſtome, were appropriat to Biſhops, which (ſaith he) they did as Evangeliſts, as one of them is expreſſly called. As for jerom, it is certain that he both mantaines and proves the Biſhop and elder to be one in Scripture, when diſputing that point in his Commentar upon Titus: and therefore when at any time he gives theſe evangeliſts ſuch appellations, he doth it alluſively, and improperly, according to the degenerat cuſtome of his time. As for the Catalogues of Biſhops, from Scriptur times, they are found to terminat upon Apoſtles or Evangeliſts, as that of Ieruſalem, comes up to Iames the Apoſtle: that of Antioch, to peter: So that of Rome, to peter, and Paul: that of Alexandria, unto mark &c: Now, they were not ordinary officers, nor ſucceeded in *eundum gradum*. And beſid, there are eccleſiaſtick cuſtomes traced up (by ſome to the Apoſtolick tymes, which not with ſtanding are acknowledged not to be of divine oppointment. Some firſt Biſhops were but primi presbiteri (as we ſhall after ſhew) How loſt they the ſole power of ordination and juriſdiction, which their firſt founders had, in ſo ſhort a time? This ſole power in ordination and juriſ-

diction

diction (which our prelats now acclaime, and this man pleads for) will not be found till Three hundred years after Christ, if at all then. The gross mistak of many ancients in their constituting of Bishops, appears in this instance. That many fathers affirm peter to have been Bishop of Rome, and to have continued Bishop there for many years. Yet *Marsilius patavinus* pars: 2. c: 16. *Carolus Molinæus*, *Scen: Consult: franc: contr: abusus* &c: *Paparum*) proves by scripture and reason that peter was never at Rome. In a word, the ancients call them Bishops, as likwayes Apostles such, not properly (saith *Bucer.* de Gub: Eccles: p. 432. So fox, Act mon: p. 11465) but in a large or general appellation, because they first preached the gospel to these Churches—— and to this end, To prove a perpetuall succession of sound preachers, and sound doctrine, in those particular Churches from the Apostles tyme to their own; nameing the eminentest Ministers for parts and gifts, the Bishops of these Churches: which Method & scope of Catalogues, appears by *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, cited by Mr prin. (un Bish: of Tim: and Tit: p. 34.)

The *Doubter* objects against Timothies Episc. *That he was ordained by the layingon of the hands of the presbytery* 1. *Tim* 4. 14. *and therefore could not be a Bishop, Since a Presbytery which is a company of Ministers, cannot make a Bishop.* To this the Informer returns, 1. *That Calvin thinks that by presbytery is meaned the office.* I answer, Suppose *Calvin* think so what will that say to the argument it self? Againe *Calvine* upon the place, doth not wholly dissoun the ordinary comment, which takes the presbytery for a company of elders, but thinks it may wel sustean. *Presbiterium qui hic* (saith he) *Collectivum nomen esse putant, pro collegio presbiterorum positum, recte Sentiunt meo judicio. Such as esteem the presbitery here, to be a collective word put for the assembly of elders, doe rightly judge in my judgement.* Besids that the greek word πρεσβυτέριον or Presbyterie, especially as it stands

here constructed, cannot in any tollerable sense import the office, for the office hath no hands to lay on.

2 The *Informer* flies to his old shift *of shruding the diocesian Bishops under the lapp of these presbyters*, which he tells us *we need not think strange of since he hath skewed that the* [*Apostles*] *are called elders or* [*presbyters.*] *Ans.* Wee have already disproved what he alledges from the Apostles being called elders (in a generall sense) here, as befor, he but begges the Question in supposing his imaginary different degrees of preaching presbyters or Pastours to be at this tyme existent, which (untill he make it appear from Scripture) is as easily denyed by us, as affirmed by him. What a pitiful cause must that be which needs the support of such vaine shifts? In phil: 1. and Act. 20. Bishops (diocesian *Bishops*) must be set up among the presbyters. So here they must be brought into this presbytery, whereas the very Question is anent the *being* and *existence* of any such Bishops at all at this tyme. *Next*, If his man were posed upon it, why he maks *the presbyters* here to be of his imagined hiest class *of diocesian Bishops*, and not also in all places where they are mentioned, as Dr. Hamon doth: And how it comes that there were so many Bishops so early here befor Ephesus, Crete, and other Churches had even his inferiour elders or ordinary Ministers? He could give no answer but what would render him rediculous, in his running the Circlestick, and begging the Question. Besides Timothy was yet no Bishop, for he was advanced to this office when set over Ephesus in the *Informers* judgement: and he was now only (with him) a sort of unfixed preacher of the gospell, or ane Evangelist in his large sense. And *Hooker* sayes the Evangelists were presbyters of prime sufficiency assumed by the Apostles to attend them. This resolver will have him to be no other wayes ane Evangelist, then

then Philip, who, he supposes, was still a deacon when so termed. Thus it evidently appears that Timothy, according to him, and upon the sequel of that answer, receaved at the utmost but a meer presbyterat in his ordination; and then I wonder what needs a number of Bishops be mustered together for ordaining him? Might not Paul and the Inferiour presbyters ordaine such ane one? Thus we see he is still inconsistent what himself in all his shifts. But he hath a 3d. Answer taken *from the laying on of pauls hands, mentioned* 2. Tim. 1. 6 *which* (he sayes) *gave the substance of the ordination, although the presbyters might share in the Ceremonial part of it.* *Ans*: 1. If it were denyed that the Apostle 2. Tim. 1. 6 affirmes *That Timothy was ordained by the laying one of his hands* since hementiones onely [the gift conferred by the laying on of his handes which] Paul might confer upon him antecedaniously to his ordination, since he laid on hands in order to gifts of the Spirit abstracting from ordination as other Apostles did Act. 8. 17. And also becaus the different maner of expression in 2. Tim. 1. 6. and 1. Tim 4. 14. viz, διὰ in the one place, and μετὰ in the other, diversifies the conferring *of gifts*, and the *ordination*, or at least wil plead that Pauls laying on of hands was in order to the Conferring of the gifts, and not necessarie for the ordination it self, which he receaved intirely by the laying on of the presbyteryes hands, even supposeing that they were both contemporaries; If I say, Some presbyteri in *Doubter* should suggest these difficulties to our *Informer*, he would be puzled to come liquide off with this his answer. Surely [the Charisma] *the gift*, is a differing thing from *the office*. And the Apostles laying on of hands as ane Apostle, being in a speciall way in order to the end mentioned thoug contemporarie with the presbytryes action, yet might be temporary and expired. 2. What Calls he *the ceremonial part* (distinguished from that substantial pat

of his ordination, which Paul gave) which he admitts the presbyters unto, *if we will.* Nay Sir, we will not; 'tis known your party are much in love with ceremonies, and we quite them unto you, where they want substance. Was it the Ceremonial part to lay on hands? Then *I* would propose to our Informer. 1. That since this was neither in order to the gifts, which Paul gave, nor any part of the sacred authority and mission as a Church officer, which Paul only gave according to him, what signified their laying on of handes at all? Was it only to signifie their consent? Where can he shew in all the scriptures, where laying on of hands is mentioned, that it Imports onely consent, and not authoritie? this Ceremonie, borrowed from the old Testament, doth alwayes present a badge of ane Authoritative blessing, flowing from Prophets, Patriarchs and others, to which though there were many assenters, yet none of these assenters laid on hands. Next, since this Ceremonie was used by our Lord, towards his Apostles, and thereafter by them, and particularly in this work: & withall, since it must needs Import here a solemne blessing of, a setting apart unto God, and sending out into his vineyeard, the person thus ordained (not to debate whither this Ceremonie be of the essence of ordination, as some judge, yea or not) let our *Informer* shew me, why it may not, upon all these grounds be looked upon as a badge of *Ministerial* authority, and supposing this authority inherent in the presbyters. I would ask him, 3. Since Paul commended the whol official power of ordination & jurisdiction, to the presbyters, Act. 20. & Peter. 1. Epist. 5. Ch: Imputs ane ἐπισκοποῦντες, or actuall exercise of Episcopall authority, *to the elders*, who were (as himself acknowledges) *set over the flocks onely*, and so none of his imaginary *Prelat elders*? With what sense or reason, can he or any else say that they could not share in the *substantials of ordination*. many no doubt concurred

curred with the publick blessing at Timothies ordination: for I suppose it was done in the view and presence of the assembly, But did any of them lay on hands? Besyds, we might here tell him that the word πρεσβυτέριον, or presbytery, doth alwayes Import a juridicall authoritative Court, so the word is taken Luk. 22. 66. and Act. 22. 5. As likewayes the word [presbyter] Imports ane officer cloathed with authority, so that this Court of elders, must needs have ane interest in much more then the rituales of ordination.

His Last Exception, is, *That upon our supposition, That Timothy was ane extraordinary officer and Evangelist, he could not be ordained by ordinary inferiour officers or Ministers. Ans.* 1. As some say of the Prince, that though Major Singulis, greater then every single person, yet he is, Minor universis, lesse then the whol body, so it may be said, that though Timothy, as ane Evangelist, were superiour to any meer elder; yet ane eldership, the juridical Court, the Church representative, might be above him; if at least such a superiority was here necessary; else let him say, whither the Prophets at Antioch, were in Capacity to Impose hands upon Paul, and Barnabas, and send them out upon a gospel legation. Himself is bound to answer this, whither these Inferiour officers, in that act, were greater then he, yea or not, and how these ordinary officers and teachers could authoritatively bless, and lay hands upon ane Apostle. And when he hath cleared this, he will easily exped our difficulty in this point. 2. Though it were granted, that a presbytery, consisting of *meer ordinary officers*, could not ordain ane Evangelist, yet I hope he will grant, that a presbytery, where *such a one as paul was*, might doe it, who as ane Apostle, might ordaine alone. If he say, what is then beeome of our *presbyterial ordination*, which we draw from this text? I answer, it is much confirmed, but not weakened by what is said, for if the Apostle

Paul took along in this high Act [the ordination even of ane Evangelist] the authoritative concurrenc of a Presbytery, therefore much more doth this power of ordination belong to the Presbytery now, in relation to ordinary Church officers or fellow Presbyters, when the office of Apostles and Evangelists is ceased. 3. If the ground and topick of our *Informer's* argument [*They who ordaine must be greater then he who is ordained*] were denied, he would be more puzzled to make it good, then he Imagines. Because 1. The blessing in ordination being only *ministerial and instrumental* by way of service but not by ane *original primative authority* (as a learned man distinguishes here) God and Christ alone ordaining thus, whose servants and Ministers, both the ordained and ordainers are. Ephes. 4: 11, 12. 1 Cor. 12: 28. Matth. 9: 37, 38. 2 Cor. 4: 5. 1 Cor. 3: 5, 21, 22. Act. 13: 1, 6. The ordination will no more infer a superiority over the ordained, then peoples blessing of God will make them greater then Hee, Jacobes blessing of Pharaoh, will make him greater then Pharaoh, the peoples blessing of Solomon, greater then Solomon. The Kings Acturney (saith he) who drawes the noble-man or officer of state, His patent and commission, is not greater then hee, But the King who is the original of temporall honour. So Ministers in this work doe only draw out the Kings patent and apply it, but Christ only is the *original proper ordainer.* As for that text, Hebr. 7: 7. He sayes it is meaned of Christ himself who by Melchisedeck his type, blessed Abraham by his own inherent authority and power. 2. Admitting that the ordainers, behoved to be greater then the ordained *before the ordination is execut*, yet it will not necessarly follow, that they must be still greater *after the ordination is past* & finished, the very end of it being to conferr upon the ordained a *like Ministery* with that which themselves

selves have. Hee instances Matthias and Paul, who were inferiour to the Apostles, before they were called and ordained: But being called, they became equal with other Apostles in Apostolick power, dignity, degree, &c. Wee might exemplifie this in other instances, (if intending to Press it) As the armie Creats the Emperor, which of the two is greater? Three Bishops creat a Metropolitan, the Council of Cardinals a pope &c. But enough is said to rectifie our *Informer's* thoughts of Timothy and Titus and so we proceed unto his next Argument.

## Chap. XI.

*The* Informers *pleadings for Prelacy from the seven Asian Angels, discussed. That the stile of Prophetick writinges, and of this book, doe strongely conclud a collective sence of the term* Angel, *fully proved. The admitting the Angel to be a single person, will not help the Informer. his reasonings from the pretended Catalogues of succeeding Bishopes in these Churches, frivolous and vain, as also his new Argument taken from* [*diotrephes's love of preeminence,*] *wherein he imbraces* Bellarmins *evasiones, and offers violence to this, and parallel Texts.*

OUR *Informers* next great Argument for Prelacy, is taken from the seven Asian Angels Revel. 23. Whom he holds to be Dioceſian Bishops: *Because though there were many Ministers at* Ephesus *Act.* 20. *Yet when that Church long after this is written to; and when increased there*

*is but one Angel addreſſed, and commended, or blamed, according to what was well, or amiſſe in the Church: And in all the reſt whatever is commended or diſcommended, is directed to one Angel, who by his place and authority, was mainely concerned therein.* *Anſ:* This man, if he had been ſo ingenuous and ſeen in this debate, as he would appear, might have found all this, and much more then he hath offered, fully removed and anſwered by many Godly learned. But they muſt ſtill tell over and over, their old baffled arguments, to which ſatisfying anſwers have bein often returned. But to the point, the weaknes of this proofe; is many wayes evident. 1. It is grounded upon a Miſterious Metaphorick terme of *Angel, and ſtarrs*; Revel: 1: 20. *the miſtery of the Seven-ſtarrs*, ſo muſt the expreſſion of *Angel*, be likwayes a part of this miſtery. The Maxim is known, *Theologia Symbolica non eſt argumentativa.* Far leſs can this be rationally oppoſed unto ſo many pregnant clear ſcriptures, as are produced for Presbyterian Government. Beſides that, the word [*Biſhop*] is no where in Johns writings, made uſe of; who calls himſelf a Presbyter, and never mentions ſuperiority of one Presbyter over another, but in condemneing *Diotrephes.* He calls Chriſt *the word*, and the Sabbath, *the Lords day*; theſe are expreſſions not found before in Scripture; Surely he ſhould have made mention of a *new office*, as well as of a *new phraſe*, had any ſuch thing as *a Biſhop*, been allowed by him. Beſides, the Metaphorical terms of *Starrs*, or *Angels*, doe import the qualities of light, heavenlines of frame &c: which are proper and ſuiteble to all Miniſters of the Goſpel: and therefore they cannot ground the peculiar preheminence of a Biſhop over many Miniſters. 2. The great ropick of his argument is [*that one is named, though many are ſpoken to, and where many Presbyters are ſuppoſed to be, as at Epheſus, who t hrefore muſt needs be a Biſhop.*] but this ground will not hold

hold good. Becauſe, 1. This is no more then what is ſuitable unto the ſtile of this book, which is by miſtick viſional repreſentations, to include many individuals as one ſingular: So all the individuals of the Church, both members and officers, are repreſented by one candleſtick: and why not alſo all the Miniſters, by one angel, which is a terme that of it ſelf, and in this place, imports no juriſdiction properly, but is immediatly referred to the qualities of Miniſters, above expreſſed. 2. This is alſo ſuitable to the ſtile of this book, *as it is epiſtolar*, the addreſſe may be to one, but it will give no Authority to that one, over the reſt, no more then ane addreſſe from the King, to a ſpeaker of the Parliament, will give to that perſon, juriſdiction and authority over them? Or then our Lords ſaying to Peter only expreſſly, not to the reſt of his fellow diſciples, I *will give unto thee the keyes &c.* Will conclude that he was Prince or primat over the Apoſtles, and that they had not *equal authority* with him, in the uſe of the keyes. Our *Informer* and his fellows here, doe juſtifie the Papiſts pleading for the Pope. 3. This is ſuitable unto Scripture *prophetick writings*, and to this book, as ſuch, to repreſent many individuals by one ſingular, The four beaſts, and twentie four Elders, are not four individuall perſons, or twentie four ſingle Elders. The ſingular names of Woman, Beaſt, Whoor, Dragon, ſignifie a collection of many individuales So the one Spirit of God is called the ſeven Spirits, in the 1 Chap: With reference to his manifold operations. Dan. 8: 20. *One Ram* ſignifies many Kings of the Medes and Perſians. He that will not hearken to *the Prieſt*. Deutr. 17: 12. That is, *the Prieſts*, in the plurall. So the Prieſts lips ſhould keep knowledge and the Law is to be ſought at his mouth Mal. 2: 7. That is the Prieſts. Bleſſed is *that ſervant*, whom his Lord &c. that is, *thoſe ſervants*. Particularly, as to this

this term *Angel*, It is said Psal. 34. That the Angel of the Lord encamps about the Godly, that is, many Angels. 4. It is suitable to Scripture, and to this book, To represent ane *indefinet number*, by *a definit*. Thus all Judas Adversaries are represented by the four hornes, Zachr. 1: 18. All the Godly, and the ungodly, are represented by the five wise, and the five fooliſh Virgines Matth. 25. and in the 8. Chap of this book, The Seven Angels standing befor God, represent all the Angels. For in the 7 Chap: Mention is made of all the Angels who do thus stand. So we are to understand with the same indefinitnes oftimes the Septenary number, as the Seven pillars which wisdom hewes out Prov. 2. The seven Pastours or shepherds Mic. 5. The Seven eyes Zachr, 3. And in this very book the Seven condlesticks, Lamps, and vials, Revel, 4: 5, 15 —— 5. As wee find the scripture, and this same Apostle first naming *a multitud*, and then contracting it into *a singular*, as 2 Joh. 2. *many deceavers* are come into the world — then — *this is a deceaver* and ane Antichrist. And sometimes the individual in one sentence; turned into a multitud: as 1. Tim. 2: 15 *Shee* shall be saved, that is, the woman bearing Children —— if *they* abide in faith and Charity that is such women in General, as Beza tells us all writers doe take it: So it is as certain that this *single Angel* is turned into *many* in one and the same Epistle in this book, and spoken to in the plural, as when it is said Revel. 2. 24. *to you* and to the rest in Thyatira. and in Revel. 2: 10. we find John changing in one sentence, the singular Angel into a multitude; fear none of these things which *thow* shal suffer, Behold the devil shal cast some of *you* into prison that *yee* may be tryed &c. as in 2 Joh. 2: He changes many into One. *Finaly*, Wee have proved that the Scripture allowes of no Angels Standing-Church officers or Bishops

hops above the Pastours or Presbyters, who have in Scripture the whol Episcopall power given them, So that whatever this *Informer* shall produce as the Characteristick of this Angel, we find it applicable to Presbyters. 1. Is it the work of this Angel to preach and baptize? This Commission he will grant belongs to all Pastours. 2. Is it the power of ordination? The Scripture shewes us that this is Seated in a Presbyterv. 1. Tim. 4: 14. with Act. 22: 5. Luk. 22: 66. Matth. 18: 17. Or, 3. Is it the ruling Governeing power? Surely all Ministers are such Angels, All that watch for the peoples soules have *a joynt rule over them*, Hebr. 13. 17. And therefor none can challenge it solely to himself. In the Church of Thessalonica the laboures in the word and doctrine, *joyntlie* and indiscriminatim *sed*, joyntlie *censured* and admonished, and were joyntly the προϊστάμενοι or Rulers, to whom consequently the people were indiscriminatim (or with out any difference of one of them from another) *to submitt themselves*, 1 Thess. 5. 12. There was therefore no sole Angel or προεσὼς and ruler, but this *Prostasia* or ruleing power was in many. So was it with the Church of Ephesus Act. 20. So with these elders or Bishops 1. Pet 5. And we offer to this, or any mans serious thoughts, whither it be suiteable to divine rules, to crosse so many clear Scriptures upon the ground of a metaphorial mistick expression: and to expone them in that sense, rather then to explaine the Metaphor and mistick expression by plaine Scriptures. And whither it be not more suiteable to understand the Angel of Ephesus, of the Ministers: to whom in a plaine Scripture, the whole Government is found intrusted, rather then to expound that plaine text, (Act. 20) by a Metaphor, and contrary to that plain text, to set up one Angel or Diocesian Bishop over that Church, with sole power of ordination and jurisdiction.

But the *Doubter* objects what have been saying, viz.

*That the Angel is to be taken collectively, and not for one single person, but for all the Ministers.* To which (in a peece of petulant folly) he Answers *That he hath oft wondered at this reply, that it seems this Scripture pinches us sore, when we flie to such a shift* —— *That Sculletus, a learned Protestant, affirms that the most learned interpreters understand the Angel thus, and that without offering violence to the Text, it cannot be otherwayes understood.* *Ans.* 1. We hope is evident from what is said that the most native scriptural acception is to take the Angel collectivly. To which we may adde, that although the Lord Jesus (the best interpreter of these Angels) doth expound the Seven candlsticks, to be the Seven Churches, yet in expounding the Seven Starrs, he losses the number of Seven, and calls them not the *Seven Angels* (as he should have done according to this mans meaning) but indefinitly *the Angels* of the *Seven Churches*; from which it is convincingly apparent that though there were *Seven Churches* written unto, yet there were not *Seven diocesian Bishops*, according to the number of the Seven Angels: but that all the Ministers or Angels are thus collectively understood. And wheras this man professes (in the deept of his witt for sooth) to wonder at this answer and taks it to be a shift. He should wonder at Augustin (Homil. 21. upon this booke,) who thus taks it, expounding the Angel of Thyatira, the *præpositi ecclesiarum*, the governoures of the Churches. He should wonder at *Aretas*, lib. 1. Cap: 1, 2, 9, 10. Wonder at *Primasius* in Apoc: C: 2. At *Ambrosius*, *Anbertus*, To: 1, 6 p: 1. *Anselm*, *Pererius*, *Victorinus*, *Tirinus*, *Haymo*, *Beda*, *perkings*, *Fox*, in his Meditationes upon the Revel. p: 7, 8, 9, 17. who cites also many Interpreters thus expounding him. Yea more, he wonders at King james and the Episcopal clergie in England, under and by whom, in the contents annexed to the Bibles of the last translation, the contents in the 2. chap: are represented thus

[what is to be written to the Angels; that is, *to the Miniſters* of the Church of Epheſus, Smyrna &c] Its pitie they had not this grave dictator to correct their miſtake, and to preſent them with his new ſpectacles, to diſcover therewith, the Biſhop in theſe Epiſtles. He should have wondered at *Pilkington* Biſhop of Durham (in his expoſition upon Hag: Chap. 1: v. 13.) who expoundes the Angel thus collectivly. See Gerſ. Buc. de Gub. Eccl. p. 1. 205, 393, 408, 419, 422, 433. Now, what pinched all theſe Authors to embrace this Silleptick expoſition of the *Angel*? As for *Sculletus*, although a Proteſtant, yet he is a high Prelatiſt, and a partial witnes in this point, & cannot conterballance theſe Authores mentioned,

But next, what wil our *Informer* gain though it were yeelded that this Angel is ane individual or ſingle perſon? Some learned men doe ſo take it, as *Beza*, and *Reynolds*, who notwithſtanding were far from thinking him a Prelat. Becauſe 1. He may be the *Angelus Preſes*, or the moderatour Angel, not the *Angelus Princeps*, or Lord Angel, yea, and the Preſes and Moderator for the time, as a ſpeaker in the Parliament. Epheſus had many elders (Act 20: 27. 1 Tim. 5: 17.) of equal authority, who were made Biſhops, and they are ſpoken to in the plural, though the Angel is named in the ſingular number. 2. This Angel is ſaid to have no juriſdiction and ſuperiority over the reſt of the Miniſters. And we challeng our *Informer* to ſhew where this Angel is ſpoken unto, with reference to Miniſters, as ſubject unto him, which notwithſtanding is his ſuppoſition, & petitio principii, all along in this Argument. 3. The Parochial, and Dioceſian diviſion of Churches, were long after this and not until 260. Years after Chriſt. 4. Nothing is required of this Angel, but that which is the common duty of all Miniſters. Finally, Suppoſe it were granted to him, that a ſuperiority were imported in nameing this

Angel

Angel, It may be *a Superiority* of *Order*, *Dignity*, or *Gifts*, not of power and Jurisdiction"

But the *Doubter Objects* [*That* (*Revel.* 2 24.) *Christ by John speakes to the Angel in the plural* [*or You*] *and that therefore he means all the Ministers.*] ὑμῖν To this he answers | *That Beza by this phrase understands the president and the company of Ministers with the rest of the people, taking the Angel still for a single person, and holds that more then the Angel are spoken unto.* He tells us, *that the words are ane Apostrophe, wherein the speaker amplifies his speech, turning it to some others then those who are first spoken unto.* *Ans.* 1. We have already shown that this, and the other parallel phrase mentioned, doe strongely plead for the Angels being understood Collectivly: since the Lord makes a Plural of the singular *Angel*, as 1 Tim. 2. 15. *Shee* shall be saved if *they* continue &c. especially the above evinced equal power, and authority, of the Angels or Presbyters, who where in these Churches, being pondered. Besids, how doth this remove the objection, that *Beza* understands it some other wayes then collectively, what sayes that to the reason and argument it self? But 2. If *Beza* understand by the ὑμῖν or *you*, the moderator or president Angel with the rest of the Ministers, wherein (I pray) is our argument infringed? viz, ,, That this ,, Angel is not a Diocesian Prelat; since other Mini- ,, sters are taken in with him here as of equall authority ,, in this compellation. In *Beza's* sense this is no other language then what might have been said or writen to a presbyterian Synod with its Moderator all being equally concerned therein, and supposed equaly Angels in this Church. And if this Cutt not the sinnews of this mans designe and argument here, let any judge. 3. Non can rationally call it a turneing of the speech to any other then such as were first spoken to, ὑμῖν δὲ λέγω *But to you I Say* is a continuance of the speech to the same persons,

ſors, with ane *exegitick* explication of the [*Angel*] by ὑμῖν, or [*yow*,] eſpecially ſince they are diſtinguiſhed from [*the reſt*] or the ordinary Preſeſſores, by the Copulative, *and*. In our ordinary language, we uſually reinforce our ſpeech to the ſame perſons, and to the ſame purpoſe, with ane *emphatick* [*I ſay*] as it is here. Some Prelatiſts have a *Knack* (which I wonder our *Informer* ſtumbled not upon) in alledging that ſome copies leave out the Conjunction —— Reading it λέγω ὑμῖν τοῖς λοιποῖς that is, *to yow, the reſt in Thyatira*; making the terme [*yow*,] all one with [*the reſt in Thyatira*.] but the plaine reading of the 23. v. confutes this.

But that which the *Informer* thinkes ſhould put it out of queſtion wich us, That theſe Angels were Dioceſian Biſhops; [„ Is the Teſtimonies of the Ancients, who „ came immediatly after them, and condeſcend upon „ ſome of their names. Then he repeats to us againe the „ ſtorie of *Polycrates* Biſhop of Epheſus, borne neer the „ Apoſtles times, who, numbers Seven of his Predece- „ ſours before him and tels us That Leontius Biſhop of „ *Magneſia*, Numbers Tuenty ſeven Biſhops of Ephe- „ ſus from Timothy. That theſe Seven Biſhops of *Aſia* „ are at the Council of *Nice* deſigned by their ſtyles „ *Epheſus, Smyrna, &c.* That *Euſebius, Tertullian*, „ *Irenæus* aſſert that Iohn made *Policarp* Biſhop of *Smyr-* „ *na*. That he is thought to be the Angel to whom „ John wrote. That *Ignatius* writes to him as ſuch, „ &c. Theſe he thinkes as a comment upon this and ſuch „ like ſcriptures, ſhould convince us.] *Anſ.* 1. He forgot one maine point of this argument from Antiquity; before it convince us, he muſt condeſcend upon *the mould*, and *power*, of the Biſhops which theſe Ancients ſpeakes of; he holds that the word [*Biſhop*] is variouſly taken in Scripture, and why not alſo by the ancients? But if he had offered us Teſtimonys ſpeaking of ſole power of theſe Biſhops in

ordination and Jurisdiction, leaving nothing to Presbyters but the key of doctrine, of Bishops with a negative voice in judicatories, haveing sole Dominion over a dioceſs, the only proper Pastoures thereof; and Prelats of *Erastus* his Cutt, Then I should confeſs there were early such Bishops as he pleads for: and we should acknowledge their power to be a commentary upon the Scriptures he pleads from; But with this *proviſo*, that he could quiparat them with their *first progenitours*, and shew us theſe priviledges in *the ſcripture-Eſcutciones* of their founders. But till then, I thinke our conviction muſt be ſuſpended.

That Presbyters have *the key of Doctrine*, he will not deny, That they have *the power of ordination, and juriſdiction*, and that key likewayes entruſted to them, hath been proved from Scripture. 1. Tim. 4. 14. Luk. 22. 66. Act. 20: 28. 1. Pet. 5: 2, 1. Cor 5. 5. Now let him ſay, did theſe first ſucceeding Bishops (in their ſuppoſed dioceſſes) alwayes take this power in ordination and jurisdiction from the first Scripture Bishops, and stood inveſted therwith in after tymes? How then comes *jerom* to ſay [That even in his time] *elders were ſubject to the Bishop only by Cuſtome, not by Diſpenſation from the Lord.* (*In his Coment: on Tit:*) *and*, (*on Iſa. 3.*) *That they had* even in his time, *a cætus preſbiterorum, a meeting or Court of Presbyters, and ane Apoſtolick ſenat.*] How comes a πρεσβυτέριον or Presbytery to be mentioned, *Concancyr. Can.* 18. How comes *Ambroſe*, (a father of the Church) upon Epheſ. 4. to aſſert [That after the Church was enlarged., *Cepit alio ordine Gubernari*, It *began to be governed after another maner then at first*, ——— and that *non per omnia conveniunt*, &c. That the Government then in the Church, was not every way suitable to the Apoſtles appointment] me thinkes theſe aſſertions might convince the *Informer* of the folly of this argument.

But

But 2. What if some of these first successours, be found but meer *Constant moderators*? What is then become of his Series of a *Succession of Diocesian Bishops* from Timothy, and Titus, and the Asian Angels? saith not *Jerom* (*ad Evagrium*) *Alexandriæ Presbyteri unum ex se electum in excelsiori gradu Collocatum Episcopum nominabant, &c* That the Bishop at Alexandria was only a Presbyter Chosen to preside. &c. *Ambrose* sayes that this distinction betwixt Bishop and Presbyter, came in *by Counsil* (Cubi prius) therefor he holds it was not derived from *divine Institution* (and therein gives the lie to our *Informer*:) for that he sayes was different from their present custome. *Augustin* (*Epist*: 10.) sayes (with jerom) that by *Custome of the Church*, Episcopatus, was; Maior presbyterio, *the Episcopacy was greater then the presbyterat* How comes *Firmilianus* (apud Cypr. ep: 78.) to assert that the presbyters, *possident ordinandi potestatem, possesses the power of ordination*, and these presbyters he calls *præpositi*, *the presidents or rulers*. Ierom sayes, *quid facit excepta ordinatione Episcopus quod non facit presbiter. what does the Bishop except ordination, which the presbyter doth not,* ——— yet even in this, presbyters then concurred with them, and shared in that power. Saith not *Chrisost*: upon 1. Tim: *inter Episcopum et presbyterum, interest ferme nihil-between the Bishop and presbyter, there is almost no difference.* As for his lines of Succession, they will say nothing untill he prove these Bishops to be *Episcopos principes*, *Prince-or Lord Bishops*, and not *Episcopos presides*, or *Moderator Bishops*, which will be a hard task, since he must answer *Blondel*, who largely proves, that before the year 140. there was not a Bishop over presbyters, even the Constant president, far from the power of the present diocesian. *Policarp* himself, his supposed Bishop of Smyrna, makes but *Two orders of Ministery*, *Bishops and Deacons*, in his Epistle to the Philippians. *Dr. Reynolds* in his conference with *Hart*, proves that the first Bi-

ſhop who came in after the Apoſtles, was nothing but the προεδρος τε πρεσβυτερίου, *Moderator of the presbytery*. In a word, as many learned men doe prove the diſcrepancy of the ancients among themſelves, and their variety of names, and ſpeech in relation to theſe firſt ſuppoſed Biſhops, and that ſeveral authores are Spurius and counterfit who are Brought in to give Teſtimony in this point. So it is certain that this man and his fellowes in pleading thus for Timothies Epiſcopacy, doe put the blott of dread full Apoſtacy upon him, in making him *fall* (as the Angel of Epheſus is charged) *from his firſt love*; ſo that, if they will not runn on this inconvenience, and ſtage this eminent Saint for ſuch ane Apoſtat, contrary to the Scripture account of him, they muſt wholly quit this plea. As for what he adds [*of Several writers acknowledging the Angel a Single perſon*] we have ſhown how vaine a reaſon this is, to prove his point.

But the *Doubter* objects to ſome purpoſe [that *Beza* and others might take the *Angel* to be but *Moderater*.] To this he anſwers „ [that the *Angel* muſt needs be a „ *Biſhop*, becauſe he is cheifely commended or diſco- „ mended, as haveing a cheif hand in what was right, „ or amiſs, in theſe Churches. That the power found „ in Timothy and Titus, proves it was ſo with theſe „ Angels. —— That Beza ſayes theſe Angels power „ was more eminent then the reſt of their fellowes.] *Anſ.* 1. As for *Beza*, its true he expones [the *Angel*] „ τῷ προεδρῳ [to the preſident] —— but adds —— „ [*Sed hinc ſtatui epiſcopalis ille gradus* &c: —— „ that is, But that Epiſcopal degree, which was after- „ ward by human invention brought into the Church „ of God, nether certainly can nor ought to be hence „ concluded, nay not ſo much as the office of a perpe- „ tual preſident, ſhould be of neceſſity, as the thence „ ariſeing oligarchical tyrranny; (let our *Informer* „marke

„ marke this) whose head is the Antichristian beast „ now at length with the most certan ruine, not of the „ Church only, but of the world also, maks manifest. And this also is all which *Dr. Reynolds* acknowledges. Now I think he will find no advantage nor credit here to his Diocesian Bishop, since *Beza* maks him but a human invention, yea and the poysonous egg out of which Antichrist was hatched. 2 As for his Reason „ [That this [Angel] is chefly reproved or commen- „ ded, as haveing the Chief hand, in what was right or „ amisse.] He must prove, (before this Reason wil pass current) that *one single person is Chiefly reproved or commended*, and likewayes that his having the commendation, or reproofe *adressed to him*, will evince *a Chief authority*, or Chief hand, (as he calls it) in government. Wee told him that in *Beza's*, and *Dr. Reynolds* judgment, the [*Angel*] is only *the preses Moroderator* receaving the Epistle or address. Now, will ane Epistle containing commendations or reproofes of a Synod, and addressed to the Moderator, make him Chief as to what is commended, or taxed, in all that Synodall assembly or Church? Surely not at all. The Moderator may be a man as little concerned therein, and possibly less, then any of the meeting: Or will the Kings Message or Charge to a parliament, adressed to the speaker, containing reproofes and commendationes of that great body and assembly, fix the guilt or commendation principally upon the speaker, or president? He will not say it. As for Timothy and Titus, we have proved that they had no such power, as he pretends, and that their inspection was extraordinary and Evangelistick, which cannot with any shew of reason be said of these Seven Angels. As for *Beza* [his acknowledgment *of a more eminent Authority in government*, which these single persons had] this man cannot with any shew of reason alledge *Beza* to understand thereby any other thing beyond the

eminency of his *Epiſcopus divinus*, which with *Beza* is the Paſtour, among whom *jure divino*, he will not admit ſo much as a perpetual preſident, far leſs a Biſhop: for the perpetual preſident or Moderator, is with *Beza*, the *Epiſcopus humanus*, which he diſtinguiſhes from *the divine, or ſcripture Biſhop*; and *the dioceſian prelat* (pleaded for by this *Informer*) who hath the Chief, and ſole power in ordination and juriſdiction, is the *Satanical Biſhop*. (In his Treatiſe *de triplici Epiſcopatu*.) So that Beza cannot Imput to theſe ſingle perſons any authority over their brethren, or aſcribe to them any other eminency, then what the eminency of a Moderatorſhip will give, If *Beza* doe not compare them with the Elders of the Inferior ſort, who rule only, as ſome would readily admit, who take theſe Churches to be Congregational. As for *Mede*, it is no great matter whither he take the Angels Collectivly, or for ſingle perſons, if he Imput not to theſe Aſian Angels ane Epiſcopal Authority, which this *Informer* proves not, in „telling us, [That the Tuentie four Angels about the Thron, doe with him, repreſent the Biſhops] unleſs he can ſhew that he means his *Dioceſian Biſhops*: for he may mean the Biſhops indefinitely, according to the genuine ſcripture acceptation. He holds there are Seven Biſhops of Aſia here only written unto, where are the Tuentie four Biſhops, if *Mr Mede* take them in his ſenſe? As for *Mr. Brightman*, his exponeing ordinarly the Angel, of a ſingle perſon, as the *Informer* alleadges. „Let us hear *Brightman* himſelf. „[*To the Angel* &c.] „The Epiſtles are intituled (ſaith he) one by one, to the „Paſtours, Becauſ the ſafety of the Congregation de„pends upon the ſoundnes of the Paſtours: for there „was not *one Angel alone* at Epheſus, *but many*, Neither „yet any prince among theſe, as is manifeſt by Paul, „who to Miletum ſent for the Elders or Biſhops of „Epheſus, — adding, that nothing is ſpoken of their obe-

„ obedience *to any one Chief Bishop* —— That a „ Princehood came after the Apostles, and was not „ yet borne, save only that Diotrephes gave some „ shew of it. hence he concluds thus [therefore under „ the name of *one Angel*, the Epistle is written *to the „ whol order of Pastours* &c: ] And by this account of *Brightmans* accentation of the word *Angel*, Let any judge of our *Informers* fidelity.

But now comes his last Argument for Episcopacy (which surprises not only his *Doubter*, but I believe, Most, if not all else, who have seen it) taken from „ [Diotrephes his loveing to have the preeminence, „ 3. Joh. 9. who (he sayes) ambitiously loved to be first, „ and to have the Chief place: and that this ambition „ only John speaks against,—he adds, that ane office „ may be good and lawfull, though ane ambitions see- „ king of it, be sinfull. —That *Beza* renders it, *qui „ primatum ambit*—that our Inference of the unlawful- „ nes of the office he aimed at, will not follow from his „ seeking of this chief place, but rather that their was „ such ane office at this time in the Church, and now „ void, into which he meaned to put himself, or had „ already done so, out of ane ambitious desire to be „ great, which was a sinful end: that, he looked after „ himself, not the good of the Church.] *Ans.* 't is long since we had this answer, and glos's from Romanists, though not as ane argument. Wee see popri and prelacy in despight of all contradiction will strick hands. When Luk. 22. Touching our Lords forbidding a Dominion or primacy among his Disciples, is objected to *Bellarmin*, he resolves it just as this „ resolver. viz. „ That the Lord rather institut „ and established a *primacy* in the Church, then re- „ moved it: And commanded his vicar to preside, but „ not as the Heathen, who seek themselves, and their „ own glory and commodity. *de Pontif, Quæs.* 1. *Chap.*

3. Sect. 3.) Yee ſhall not rule as the Princes of the Gentiles (ſaith he,) Imports, that he admitts one to preſide but not after that manner. He preſſes the Greek word ηγουμενω which ſignifies a Prince or Captaine (juſt as this man doth the φιλοπρωτεύων or loving of preeminence) to ſhew that ſuch a Prince or primat was deſigned, de Pontif. Lib: 1. Ch. 9. Thus the Papiſts gloſſe generally the Text under debate. Tilen[in his Not. 67.]anſwering him, [That if it were ſo, then Chriſt rather inflamed then quenched their ambitious thoughts, which they whil φιλοπρωτευοντες, or loving preeminence, intertained] makes this ſin of diotrephes the ſame with theires which the Lord reprehended, viz. A ſinfull deſire of ane unlawfull forbidden primacy. Adding, [That the Lord ſaid not, he who by my appointment ſhall be Chieft, but he who from his ſinfull deſire would be Chieff. *Bellarmin* and the Papiſts fine notions, and old exploded evaſions, we ſee ſtands theſe men in much ſtead: And doe furniſh uſefull materials to dreſs up Prelatick pamphlets. But what will this man ſay? Will he indeed owne this popiſh Argument and anſwer upon Luk 22. Which the topick of his argument here will neceſſarly infer? Was their *a lawfull primacy* ſuppoſed among the Apoſtles, & *the ambitious deſire* only forbidden? *Bellarmin* preſſes that ane exorbitant dominion or tyrannicall only was forbidden ſince the Princes of the Gentiles are mentioned (which this man alſo taks hold of) which ſeems to put a reſtricton upon that prohibition, but there is no ſuch reſtriction in this place under debate: So that he is cut off from *Bellarmins* evaſion. We heard before he admitted a lawfull Church Dominion as not diſcharged in Luk. 22. And here he admitts a lawfull primacy over this Church, and in his pretended antiquity we will find him not to diſſowne a Chief patriarch if not directly to plead for him; And then I

ſee

see not why he may not take in the High Priest into his old Testament Argument, in relation to a morall standing primacy in Church-Government, and merite a coul in some Popish order er it be long. Now it is evident that the Apostle simply dissounes this lover of preeminence, and censures him upon the account of the preeminence he desired. And the *Informer* himself (though, as I observed before, he is not one with himself in it) acknowledges *that the Lord discharged all inequality*, and especially a πρωτος, or primat, *among the Apostles*; and therefore, why his scoler John censured not likewayes a φιλοπρωτευων or primacy-affecting Minister, seeking the same principality over his Brethren or fellow Ministers, which our Lord discharged among the Disciples, will puzell him to shew the disparity. Surely, when our Lord said, [It shall not be so among you,] and when he discharged a protos or Chief among the Disciples, recomending to the desirer of this to be their servant over whom this was affected, he spoke to them *as Ministers*, and in that capacitie: and therefore discharges this *among all Ministers*. For *a quatenus ad omne* —— I wonder if this man will say that if any of the Seventy Disciples had affected to be a *protos* over the rest, our Lord would not have given them the same injunction. Or if he will say that they did not hold themselves concerned in the same rule, and the prohibition which the Disciples here got. Surely he cannot deny this, and therfore it is Certan that John discharhes the very *protos* or *prostacy* self for what reason will it: he invent wherefor a preeminence or primacy should be disgarged to the Apostles, and allowed among the Seventy (who he thinks represents the Pastours) or any Inferiour order of Church officers? Besides, what was it which Peter discharged to these Bishops 1 Pet. 5. Was it not a preeminence, or masterly primacy, and to

be a protos? learned he not this prohibition of his Lord? and will it not be a Critical distinction to distinguish lordship from preeminence? Now the first we find universally discharged to Pastours, even over the flocks, as this man acknowledges, and therefore why this preeminence, is not likwise in it self and simply stricken against, will be Impossible to shew the disparity. I must presume that the Apostle understood the sence of this prohibition of his Lord, much better then our *Informer*: and we see he applyes to inferiour Pastours and Bishops, that which was discharged to himself, and the rest of his fellow disciples. And, (as I said befor) if none of these scripture-Bishops were to lord it over the flock, farr less over their fellowes. So that to be a *protos* or *Chief* over them, was inhibit, as by the lord befor, so by the Apostle here, and consequently this lover of preeminence is simply condemned. The *Inglish Annot:* make the two places of Peter & John, paralleel, & the same evill to be discharged in both. So doe the *dutch annot*, expressing that which diotrephes sought, in the Apostle Peters terms, *of lording it over his brethren*. Now I hope he will not say, that when Peter discharges Ministers *to be lords over Gods Heritage*, he discharged only ane *ambitious affectation* and Supposed a *lawfull Lordship* over the flocks, abstracting from this ambitious affectation. Surely then this Prohibition of the Apostle John, where *Diotrephes* is supposed to be practising, what is by Peter discharged, can admit of no such evasion either; unless he would make these Apostles to interfer together in this matter: for it were strange clashing of weapones, and contradiction of the tongues and pens of these Apostles, if Peter should discharge all Lording even over the flocks, in any Pastour, and yet John should allow unto a Pastour, a preeminence, and primacy, both over the flocks, and his fellow Ministers and labourers with him in the Lord

Lords vineyeard. *In fine*, If to be a primat or πρωτος was a lawfull office, to be a φιλος or lover of it (which is all that the word will Import) could deserve no censure. The *Informer* knowes who said [*He that desires the office of a Bishop, desires a good work*] but our Lord who spoke this by the pen of Paul, said also himself immediatly to the Apostles, & by the Apostle Iohn in this place, he that desires to be *a protos* or *Chief*, must quite that desire Hence these are different objects of desire, to be *a scripture bishop*, and *a protos or primat*. To affect the office of a scriptur Bishop, and a primacy, are Antipods: so that it was not a lawfull, nor consequently præexistent office in the Church, allowed by Iohn, which this man desired, and therefore he is simply condemned by the Apostle, both *as to the desire it self, and the object of it*. Hee who thus affects to be *first*, deserves to be called *least* in the Kingdome of God, and who thus *exalt* themselves, shall be *abased*. To all which I might add, that diotrephes Imperious lordly carriage in casting out and censureing, and not admitting into this Church, such as the Apostle appointed to be therein receaved, is a lively effigies of ane Episcopal primacy or preeminence, and of that arbitrary prelacy, that sole power in ordination and censures, which this *Informer* pleads for. Against which disorderlines of this *early primat*, the Apostles threatning of his holy censure, is a thunder-clapp which may terrifie all who carry this usurped office: and may make his Supposed Angels or Prelats, for this their aspyreing, fear the stroake and punishment *of those Angels, who keeped not their first estate, but left their own habitation.*

I shall dimiss the *Informers* last argument, with one remarke further, which is this, if the affecting to be a *protos* or *Chief*, tainted the Apostles themselves, while the Christian Church was in its first Infancy, if in Pauls time the mistery of Iniquity, and of propry, was working

king (the monstrous *embrio* of a papacy, and consequently of a Prelacy) If peter found it needfull to dischirge Covetousnes and lordship, to ministers, If the holy Apostle John was contradicted and counteracted by *ane aspiring primat*, Surely we need not wonder at that universal Change of the Apostolick Holy, humble Church Disciplin and parity among Ministers, which overspread the Christian Church not long therafter. And to our prelatists ordinary question [*When began the Change of presbyterian parity among Ministes*]? Wee may answer, That the bitter rootes of a Primacy or prelacy, were sprouting in the Apostles times; and therefore it is no strange thing that this destroying weed grew up so quickly thereafter the *inimicus* or evill one, did quickly sow his Cocle among the wheat, and blew up this fire of *ambition, primacy* pride and (his own proper sin) till it came to the flam, first of a human prostasie, then of a Hierarchy, and unto the Culmen or tope, of a chief universal primacy at last. For that which he adds of *Blondel* his granting [*That diotrephes sought to be first Presbyter, & such a president as had authority over the rest.*] Surely none who have read *Blondel* can but acknowledge, that he distinguishes all along the Presbyters set over others from the *Episcopus divino jure institutus*, So in his 1, 2, 3. and 4t. Arguments, page. 190. 191, 192, 193. &c. So that he maks the very constant fixed president (much more such a president or primat as diotrephes affected to be) distinct from the Divinely appointed Bishops: And therefore whatever he might suppose to be creeping in at that tyme, he must needs, upon this ground, interpret it to be a recesse from the divine appointment, and in so far a Corruption. As for what our *Informer* repeats here againe ad nauseam [„ That Bishops were imme-
„ diatly the Church before all the Apostles were gone
„ and imediatly after, which is a commentary upon
„ Ti-

„ Timothy, and Titus, and the Asian Angels, and „ Diotrephes.] I answer, I beleive indeed, as to his last instance, that there were *Diotrepheſies*, earely enugh, and Beza's *Episcopus humanus* or *fixed preſident*, but that there was either in the Apostles time, or ane hundered years, and more afterward (I speak far within compass) his Diocesian Prelat, with sole power of ordination and jurisdiction in a Dioces, he will assoone joyn the poles together, as prove it by any faithful and authentick Testimony.

---

## Chap. XII.

*The* Informers *appeal to antiquity in the point of Episcopacy. That antiquity is at most, testis facti, but not judex veri, may witneſs master of fact, but is no judge of what is right therein, proved from the Testimony of Scripture, and the fathers. The* Informer's *reasoning on this head, reduced to a formal Syllogisme and discussed. That in the first pureſt age the Church was governd by* Presbyters *without Bishopes, proved by Testimonys of the fathers, particularly of Ierome. His Testimony at Large vindicated from the exceptiones of the* Informer.

OUr *Informer* hath by this time got out of the straites of his Scripture Arguments for prelacy, and his pretended replyes to Scripture arguments against them. Wherin we have seen how pittifully he hes beene

been Bruillied in his endeavours to put the fairding of ſome Scripture Characters upon this Monſter, *The Dioceſian Prelat*! Now he wil lanch out in to the vaſt *Ocean* of *Antiquity* wherein he ſuppoſes (and not altogether amiſſe) that *this Leviathan* can ſwim much better. And therefore he fills up the Third part of the pamplet, with a tedious legend of human Teſtimonyes in relation to Biſhops. But in this his argueing from antiquity, he playes the ſame petty Sophiſter as in his pretended Scripture proofes. For he is ſtill pleading for a verſatil *Chimæra* of his own braine, and dare not ſtate the Queſtion, as to the Prelat now exiſtent in his *Dioceſian and eraſtian mould*, like to whom if he will ſhew me but one Prelat among all his ragged Teſtimonies, I will yeeld the Cauſe to him. So that we are not concerned in his Teſtimonies, They being all Mute or Ambiguous as to our debate. Wee ſhall therefore proceed to Conſider the ſubſtantials of his Argument on this head, and add ſome Chapters which will be found abundantly to cutt the ſinneues of his reaſoning from pretended Teſtimonies of the Fathers, and vindicat our Cauſe even in point of Antiquity.

I. I Suppoſe this man (if he will not renounce his proteſtant profeſſion) cannot but grant, that it is not *Antiquity* as he call it, or *human Teſtimonies*, but *the Scriptures of truth*, which muſt *judge in this debate*. So that I hop I may ſuppoſe that he lookes upon his Antiquitity as ane acceſſorie appendix onely to his Scripture arguments, and that the Scripture is not for him, but againſt him, I hope it is conuincingly apparent from that is ſaid above; we muſt to the law and the Teſtimony in this and all other points of faith. Antiquity without the firſt Scripture antiquity, deſerves not the name. *Id adulterum quod poſterius, id verum quod primum*, ſaid *Tertullian*. That is adulterat which is Laſt, and trere which is firſt. I am the way, the truth and the

the Liſe, ſaid Chriſt, but not I *am Cuſtome* And *Cyprian* tells us, that *Conſuetudo ſine veritate eſt vetuſtas erroris*; Antiquity without truth, is but a mouldy error. Our Lord himſelf rejected this argument [*it was ſaid of old*] and appoſes unto it [*but I ſay*] Well may we then oppoſe the Scripture ſayings to our *Informer's* [it was ſaid of old] and by our Lords warrand, reject his pretences from Antiquity, to warrand any thing which the word condemnes: and for this we have good warrand of antiquity it ſelf: for the fathers univerſaly doe hold that onelie the Scriptures muſt judge in points of faith. *Sunt libri Dominici quorum authoritati utrique conſentimus, utrique credimus* (there being in them all things to be believed and practiſed) *utrique ſervimus, ibi quæramus eccleſiam, ibi diſcutiamus cauſam noſtram*, is „ great *Auguſtins* advice. „The books of the Lord are „ they to whoſe Authority we both conſent, which we „ both beleive, To which we both ſubmit, There let „ us ſeek the Church, There let us diſcuſſe our Cauſe. Jerom on Chap. 23 of Matth. tells us *quod de ſcripturis authoritatem non habet, eadem facilitate contemnitur quæ probatur* That which derives not its authority from Scripture, the contemneing of it is as ready as the proof is offered, and (on the 1.) Chap. of Hag *Quæ abſque authoritate & Teſtimoniis ſcripturarum quaſi traditione Apoſtolica ſponte reperiunt atque confingunt, percutit Gladius „Dei.* „Such things as men of there own accord find out „ & forge upon pretence of Apoſtolick tradition with „ out the authority and Teſtimonies of Scriptures, the „ ſword of God ſtrikes throw the ſame. Beſides this diſcovers the plea from Antiquity to be very Impertiment in this debate: Becauſe the Queſtion betwixt us is not *de facto*, but *de jure*, not what ſort of Biſhops have been as to matter of *fact*, introduced into the Church of old, or of late, but by what *warrand* and *right* they have poſſeſſed their places? We alledge and prove

that

that the present Prelat now existent stands condemned by Christ, the great lawgiver, his rules in point of Church Government, set down in his Testament. Now, to answer this Charge with humane Testimonies, as to Custom or practise of the Church, (even granting that his Testimonies did prove the matter of *fact*, viz, That our present Prelat is exemplified in the ancient Bishops) what is it but to oppose, humane corruption to Gods ordinance, The practise of men to Gods rule, and mens Testimonies who are liars, to the divine Oracles of the God of truth.

This man thinkes it a Herculean argument, when he drawes his human Testimonies, as to prelacy neer the Apostles time (as if he had travelled to *Herculs pillars*) and wonders how we can suppose, that the Church could so soon alter the divine institutions. But *I* pray, how long was it after Gods Holy law was proclaimed from heaven, by his own terrible voice, that the wholl Church of Israel, together with Aaron himself, set up and worshiped the golden Calf, contrary unto the very expres letter of the *Second* command? Now, suppose that idolatry several hundered years afterward had pleaded this Antiquity, or ancient Custome of the Church of Israel, (after frequently imitated, and which had its plausible pretexts of intention to worship God, for *the feast was proclaimed to Jehova*, and to have a visible signe of his presence) Wil the *Informer* say, that this had been a good argument to warrand the breach of the *Second command*, though this Practise was but fourty dayes younger then the promulgation if self. So the case is here, Though he could shew us human clear Testimonies, nay more, even Scripture Testimonies, as to the *factum*, that the diocesian, yea, and Erastian Prelat, had been existent and set up in some Churches in the Apostles own time, yet if we can from our Lord, and his Apostles doctrine, and

practise

practise, prove this officer to be a plant not of a divine plantation, and contrary to the divine institutiones, He must needs grant (that though esteemed golden) it ought to be Nehushtan, rejected and pluckt up by the roots. The Papists, who hold the Scriptures to be but a half-rule, made up by traditions, yet will not dare to own (professedly at least) any principle, or practise, condemned in the Word. suppose he could bring thousands of Testimonies from ancient writers, touching his Prelat he pleads for; they are but *human Testimonies*, and therefore cannot beget *a divine faith*, which is founded upon the word only. *Surge veritas ipsa Scripturas tuas inter, retare, quam consuetudo non novit. nam si nosset non esset, saith Tertullian. Arise o! truth it self, and expone they Scriptures, which custome hath not known, for had it known them, it had not been.* The *Informer's* Testimonies may induce to believe that there were Bishops in the Church; but whither the office which these Bishops are supposed to hold, be of God, yea or not; this queston must be brought to a higher tribunall; and Gods Oracles must determine therein, before the Conscience can be satisfied, as to the owning of such a Church officer: And if God disowne him, I may be ane *Athanasius contra orbem*, in withstanding him, It being still certain that these human witnesses are *testes facti* at most, but not *judices veri & recti*, Attesters of *matters of fact*, but not *judges of what is right* and equal therein.

Thus we have seen, that though all our *Informers* pleading from antiquity, were granted, his cause, profliga by Scripture weapons lyes grovelling in the dust. wheras he alleadges [ *Testimonies as to the existence of Prelats in the Christian Church, neer the Apostles times, or contemporary with them, & that Catalogues of a Succession of Prelats, down from Apostles and Evangilists, have been keept in Churches, which he thinkes speakes convincingly for the Episcopacy*

*of Timothie, and Titus &c.* I *Anſ.* Although this be the very Marrow and ſtrength of all his argument from Antiquity, yet when tryed, it will be found many wayes defective, and unſound. For clearing wherof I ſhall offer ſome things, both to the Major, and aſſumtion of this argument, which will be found quite to breake the force of al his pretences this way. For thus the argument muſt run.

If *Dioceſian Biſhops, by the Teſtimonies of the ancient fathers, did exiſt in the primitive times, and Catalogues of them are drawn by theſe ancients, from Apoſtles, and Euangeliſts, then* I *muſt believe theſe Biſhops to be of divine inſtitution: but thus it is by the Teſtimony of the ancient fathers:* Ergo, I *muſt believe Dioceſian Biſhopes to be of divine inſtitution.*

Now this being the argument in its genuine ſtrength, this pitifull pleader offers not a jott in proofe of the major propoſition, whoſe connexion he cannot but know, tht we all deny. All that he offers is in proofe of the aſſumption, which is alſo denyed, & will be found very maimed. I. To the Major, I ſay, that it is of very dangerous conſequence, to make that which men call *antiquity*, or [*ancient cuſtome,*] *the infallible rule, and commentary, as to the nature and office, of Church officers, mentioned in Scriptur.* Becauſe 1. *If mens practiſe* muſt be the key and comment in this caſe, ſo as we muſt not contradict or counteract it, then why may not alſo human practiſe, and profeſſion of ſucceeding ages, determine as to every Scripture truth, and duty therein held out? 2. This were to ſet up a higher rule, and tribunal, then the Scriptures, and to *make our faith to ſtand in mans wiſdome, not in Gods*, and to make the Scriptures of *a privat interpretation*, as if the Prophecy had come *by the will of man.* For if I muſt believe no otherwayes anent the Scriptures relating

to

to the offices of Timothy, and Titus, then according to the practiſe of ſuppoſed Biſhops, their ſucceſſores, and that they held no other offices, but ſuch as theſe ſuppoſed ſucceſſores are ſaid to have had, then the Cuſtome and practiſe of fallible men, becomes to me, the *Non*, the ratio a priori, and the chief ground, why I believe theſe Scriptures to have ſuch a ſenſe and no other; and ſo I give men a dominion over my faith, and my faith herein reſolves ultimatly into a human practiſe, and Teſtimony of fallible men, which is a principle no proteſtant will allow.

Next, as to the aſumption of the argument, I would demand of this *informer, how I muſt be infallibly aſſured anent this univerſal judgment and practiſe of the ancient Church, and of this true ſucceſſion; and how he will inſtruct the univerſal harmonius judgement of all the ancient Fathers in this great point*, (viz.) „ [That ſuch prelates as we have „ now, were the firſt recipients of the ordinary power „ of government, from the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts, „ as their only immediat & ordinary ſucceſſors.] The topick of our *Informers* argument doth ſuppoſe the certanty of this mater of fact. But to clear this will be found a hard peece of work. Becauſe 1. It is certan that many of the ancients wrote nothing; many of their writings are loſt; many writings going under their name are counterfit, & moſt eſpecially to this debate. It were poſſibly none of the hardeſt Tasks to diſcover ſome writings here cited; to be meer counterfites. How ſhall I know, that the Teſtimonies of thoſe who have written, are not contradicted in this point, by ſuch men of their times, who either have not written, or whoſe writings are periſhed? 2. There are many things, which the Ancients ſpeak of as derived from the Apoſtles, and have had ane univerſal conſent (as farr as the knowledge thereof hath come to us) which are acknowledged to be contrary to the word of God

and the Apostolick doctrine; as, the error anent the vision of God, [that the Saincts sie not his face till the last day.] the error of [free will,] which until *Augustin* opposed it was universally receaved. the [Millenary error,] anent Christs personall reigne upon the Earth a Thousaudyears; called by *Lactantius*, [the doctrine of the holy prophets, and christian wisdome, which christians follow.] *Justin Martyr*, holds them to be no christians that disown this: and this is owned as *ane Apostolick tradition.* So [childrens partaking of the Lords suppers] and [the necessity of baptisme] was by Augustin and others owned as such a tradition (lib: 1. de pecc: mer.) *Basil* names four Apostolick traditions, signeing with the cross; praying to the east; anointeing with oyle; praying in the standing postur from Easter to whitsuntyd. See the *Appendix to jus divinum minist. Evan (prop.* 2.) The *informer* and his fellowes, make a great buistle anent the condemneing of Aerius, for holding that Bishops and presbyters are all one. But *Beza* could have informed him. de grad: (345.) that Epiphanius (Hæres: 75) imputs to him, as great heresies, these Tenets, 1. That he held it unlawfull to offer and pray for the dead. 2. That he held that Saincts departed were not to be invocat. 3. That there were not fixed fast dayes to be keept. 4. That the jewish pascal was not to be observed, becauſe our passover is alreadyoffered. Now, if our *Informer* condemne him for these also, we weed care the lesse for his condemning him inthe point of prelacy. 3. It is certain, that the account of the first times immediatly after the Apostles, is, as to mater of fact, very dark & uncertain, & consequently a very slippery rule. *Hegesi pus* (apud Euseb: libr 3. Cap: 28.) tells us, [that immediatly after the Apostolick age was gone, *tunc impii erroris conspiratio, per seductionem eorum qui alienam doctrinam tradebant, initium cæpit* ——— Then the conspiracy of wicked error, but the seducings of those

those who delivered another doctrine, took its beginning. *Eusebius* himself the prime writer, (from whom in a manner is the wholl of all that is delivered anent Church Government and Bishops, and who presents these fragmens of writers out of which our episcopal men gather up their proofes) in the proem of his History acknowledges that he is in that worke entered into a dark desert, therein he hath no footsteps of any goeing before him, but only σμικρὰς προφάσεις Some litle occasions, or some pitty narations, which every one in their own time hath left and delivered. let any read *haumer* (ane Inglish Bishop), his translation of *Eusebius*, wherein this will be found very clear. *Scalliger* (prolegom in Chron. Euseb.) Saith, „ Intervallum illud ab ultimo capite actorum &c. „ the nterval from he last chatter of the Acts of the „ Apostles, until the midst of the reigne of *Trajan*, in „ which tract, *Quadratus* and a *Ignatius* flourished „ (let our informer observe this as to *Ignatius*) may be „ truly called with *vatro αδηλον* or obscur, wherin no„ thinthat is certan, hath come to our hand concerning „ the affairs of Christians, except some very few „ things, which the enemies of godlines catches up „ by the way, such as *Suetonius, Cornelius Tacitus, Plenius Cecilianus*, which gap that Eusebius might fill „ up, he drew some things without discretion and „ choise out of the upotiposes or exemples of I know not what Clement (for he is not that learned Clement „ who wrote the Stromata) and out of the fyve books „ of hegesippus a writer no better. Tilen himself (a great pleader for the Episcopal cause) yet tells us (Contr: 3: l. 2: c. 2: Not. 39. and c. 3. Note. 6) That „ the history of these first times hath great blanks „ and gapes, which the Spurius Clemens and other „ writers of the same stamp, filled up with petty „ fables drawen from their own braine. — That from „ the end of the acts of the Apostles, untill *Traians* ti„ mes,

„mes, thereis almoſt nothing extant which is certain: „hence (he ſaith) occaſion was taken by men of bad „diſpoſitions to make hold to faine any-thing, whom „even the Apoſtles times wanted not. Not to inſiſt upon the many things written and obſerved of *Euſebius*, which may invalidat the credit of his hiſtory, and his many groſs errors therein, and in other poynts, obſerved by *Scalliger* and others. How fabulous is that hiſtory of Chriſtes Epiſtle to *Agbarus*, rejected even by pope *Gelaſius* in a Councel of Seventy Biſhops at room. That which *Philo* the jew wrote of the *Eſſæans*, a Sect among the jewes, *Euſebius* affirms that he wrot it of *Chriſtian monks*, which *Scalliger* ſhewes to be falſe out of Philo himſelf (*in elencho trihæreſii.*) He proves peters crucifixion at Rome by a tomb proofe. —In the computation of times, *Scalliger* obſerves his groſs errors. Nay, which is more conſiderable, he diſcovers groſs ignorance of Scripture, in ſaying that the Cephas reprehended by Paul, was not the Apoſtle peter, but another of the number of the Seventy diſciples. Beſyds, many things in his perſonall cariage and qualities, which may weaken the Credit of his Hiſtory, as his preſideing in the councel of Tyre againſt *Athanaſius*, and ſtanding upon the Arrians ſide. *Scalliger* (in his Theſaurus temporum. Animad: p: 268) Setts down the teſtimonies of the Ancients concerning his errors & Arrianiſme, wherein ſome affirme that he died. When he wrote the hiſtory he was ane Arian. Moreover, Admitt his Teſtimony were abeve all exception, yet that his hiſtory hath been corrupted by ſome ignorant impoſtor, is demonſtrated from this by *Didocl*: (cap. 4. p. 119) [that he maks mention of *Sozomen*, who was born ane hundred years therafter.]

Laſtly, As to the *Catalogues of Biſhopes*, which our *Informer*, and his maſters befor him, exhibit to us from the Apoſtolick times, he might have found them aboun-

aboundantly invalidat by many of the learned, whose judgement and Testimonys are collected by *Didocl*: (cap: 4 p. 121 : 122, 123, 124, &c.) Which we may well challeng this man to answer. Therefore we shall dismiss it with these obserues. 1. That Tertullian, *Irenæus*, and others, who make use of this Argument of Succession, against hereticks, designe only to shew a derivation of true doctrine from the Apostles against them, and that the Church had the *Traduces Apostolici Seminis*, a derivation of the Apostles Doctrine, but never meaned it of a Succession of *men of the same office* every way. *Tertullian* saith,[ Arise o truth and expone they Scriptures &c.] *Irenæus* in his time, speaking of this Succession from the Apostles, & pressing adherence to the truth which they delivered, makes mention of Presbyters [ *opportet adhærere iis* &c: We must adhere to them who keeps the Apostles doctrine, and with the order of[ presbitery] mentain the word. And again, therefore we must obey these [ presbiters ] who are in the Church, who have their Succession from the Apostles, as we have shown. Then he adds *qui cum Episcopatus Successione, charisma veritatis certum, Secundum placitum patris acceperunt.* That is, who with the Succession of Episcopacy, have receaved from the father the sure gift of truth.] thus he, (l. 4. c. 44.) And because this *Informer* singes their old song who before him, will still Shuffle in *Bishops*, when the Ancients speak of *Presbyters*. Let him remarke what he sayes (lib: 3. cap. 2.) Speaking of the contumacy of the adversaries of truth [*quum autem ad eam iterim traditionem, quæ est ab Apostolis, quæ per Successiones presbyterorum in Ecclesiis custoditur, provocamus* „ *eos &c*: — „ But when wee apeall them again to „ that tradition, which from the Apostles, is pre- „ served by Succession of Presbyters in the Churches — They will alledge that they are more wise then the

Apoſtles themſelves or theſe Presbyters ] dare this man ſay, that *Irenæus* meaned that it was only a Succeſſion of Biſhops in theſe Churches who keep that Apoſtolick truth.

That Presbyters are ſucceſſoures of Apoſtles properly and immediatly in the power of the keyes, is evident by a full Teſtimony of ancient fathers. *Ignatius* (about whom our *Informer* makes a great buſtle in ſeveral places of his Pamplet) in the Epiſtle *ad Trallianos*, calles the *cætum Presbyterorum*, the Aſſembly of Presbyters, „ *Conjunctionem Apoſtolorum Chriſti*, a meeting of Apoſtles of Chriſt. *Irenæus*, (lib: „ 4. Cap. 43) holds *Presbyteros in Eccleſia ab Apoſtolis ſucceſſionem habere*, that Presbyters in the Church have there ſucceſſion from the Apoſtles. Cyprian (lib 4. epiſtol. 9.) aſſerts, *omnes præpoſitos „ vicaria ordinatione Apoſtolis ſuccedere*, that all overſeers (ſo he calls Presbyters) ſucceeds the Apoſtles by a vicarious ordination. Ierome, on 2. Chap. of mica, (cited by *Gratian* in decretis diſtinct. 5. cap) ſpeaking of himſelf a Presbyter, ſaith *ſi in Apoſtolorum loco ſimus, non ſolum ſermonem eorum imi„ temur &c.* „If we be in the Apoſtles place, let us „ not onely imitat there doctrine, but alſo their converſation. Auguſtin (ſerm: 36. to the fratres in Eremo) and theſe too Presbyters, call them *ſal terræ, Apoſtolorum ſucceſſores, the ſalt of the earth and the Apoſtles ſucceſſours.*

2. As it is certan, that theſe Catalogue-drawers, did not underſtand *veri nominis epiſcopos*, or *dioceſian Biſhops properly ſuch*, though ſpeaking after the manner of their times they gave them all one name: So it is equally certain, that the Teſtimoyns out of which theſe Catalogues are patched up, are moſt inconſiſtent and contradictory to one another (as the divines at the ile of Wight, and many learned men have made appear)

and

and ſtill the nearer the Apoſtles times, the Catalogues are the more darke and various. They make Peter Biſhops of Rome (a fable contradicted by many of the learned & proved to be ſuch) but whither *Clemens* was firſt or Third, and who or in that order next after Succeed them, whither *Linus*, or *Anacletus* is never yet cleared, Some make Titus Biſhop of Crete, ſome Archbiſhop, Some Biſhop of Dalmatia. Timothy and John are made by many Biſhops at the ſame time. Some ſay *Policarp* was firſt Biſhop of Smyrna. Some make him ſucceed one *Bucolus*. ſome make *Ariſto* firſt. Some give Alexandria one Biſhop, ſome two at once. See appendix to jus divin. min. Evangel.

And wheras our *Informer* replyes [that notwithſtanding of this, yet all agree that a Succeſſion of Biſhops was, and that theſe different relations cannot impeach the certainty of the Succeſſion it ſelf, no more then difference about the Succeſſion of princes will invalidat the certainty of the Hiſtory] I anſwer, if he could prove that they underſtood *Biſhops properly ſo called, or his dioceſians* in all theſe Catalogues of Succeſſion, this evaſion might have ſome Shew of truth, but it is certain that they did not. *Patres cum Iacobum Epiſcopum vocant &c. the Fathers*, ſaith *Whittak.* (*de pontif queſt: 2. c. 15 ſect: 2.*) When they call James Biſhop or Peter, take not *the name of Biſhop properly*, but they call them Biſhops of theſe Churches, wherein they ſtayed for ſome time — and againe —— [if ſpoken of a *Biſhop* properly, its abſurd to ſay the *Apoſtles* were *Biſhopes*, fore het hat is properly *a Biſhop* cannot be ane *Apoſtle*, Becauſe the Biſhop is ſet only over one Church, but the Apoſtles were founders and overſeers of many Churches]. After he tells us, *that non procul diſtat ab inſania &c.* it differs little from madnes to ſay that Peter or any other Apoſtles were Biſhopes. And to this purpoſe he ſpeaks afterwards at large [Q:

3. c: 3. Sect: 9. [proveing this from the unfixed extraordinary nature of their message or mission, who were to follow the Spirits conduct towards all places whither they were called. Which argument reaches evangelists upon the same ground. So that *Whitaker* will send our *Informer* to *Bedlam*, if he mend not this information, and revocke not this principle anent the Episcopacy of Apostles and Evangelists, and the Succession of Bishops from them. The learned *Iunius* also (Contr: 3 lib: 1. cap. 23. not. 3.) mantaines ane æquivocall acceptation of the word [*Bishop*] in this matter, so that his paralleel holds not, as to a difference about the Succession of Kings, when a Monarchy all a e Supposed such, but here the difference and equivocation is, as to the *authority of these Succeeding Bishops*. When he shall read *Scallig.* (Animadvert: 277.) The *Informer* may possibly suspect *Hegesippus* his naration anent James; yet *jerom* and *Eusebius* depend upon him. Scalliger holds *Clemens Romanus* to be no better. likwayes *jerom* (: Catol: Scrip:) is a Counterfit, not the true *jerom*, since he mentions pope *hilary*, who lived long after *jerom* was in his grave.

And wheras the Informer maks a great outcry of *jerom* [that *jerom* begins at the Evangelist Mark, in the Alexandrian Catalogue, which our writters leave out in their citations] its easily answered that it needs not be putt in, since the Author, sayes [A *marko*, from, or after him, the Presbyters choosed out one whom they made president] wherein its evident, that he speaks of this custom, *after Mark*, and excluding him, who was ane Evangelist before, and needed not be set up by the Presbiters. And surely if the first Bishop was ane *Evangelist*, the rest were very heterogenious to their first pattern. Besides, in that *jerom* sayes *Presbitiri a marco unum* [*ex se*] *electum*, &c. Hee clerly insinuats that it was the Presbyters thereafter, no Mark that did

it, for if by Marks Apointment these Bishops were set up, he could not attribute it *to the Presbyters election*; Should one say, *in Scotia, a regimine presbit: Anno 62. Episcopi introducti, Ergo, ab isto regimine introducti*, were it not a bad consequence. Here I will offer to him the remarke of a learned author (Repl: to Dun: 143.) anent the Circle, whichhe and his fellowes doe ryde in this argument. Timothy and Titus &c. had ane Episcopal authority, why? becauſe their authority was not Evangeliſtick. Why ſo? becauſe it was not to die with them, why that? Becauſe it was ordinary and perpetually neceſſary. And how is that proved? Becauſe, if the Apoſtles being alive, they behooved to inſtruct Timothy and Titus with Episcopal authority, much more being dead, this was neceſſary to the Churches. But when it is inquired, how this Episcopal authority is proved, it is fairely aſſumed againe, as if it were granted, [that the Apoſtles made them Biſhops of Epheſus and Crete] So the laſt medium is ſtill that which is in Queſtion. Let him ponder alſo what *Didocl*: (p. 125. and 139.) hath produced, anent the confuſion and contradictions in this Alexandrian Succeſſion. *Tilen* himſelf (de pontif: l. 1. c: 24. not: 1.) acknowledges that [*De Alexandrinæ Eccleſiæ primordijs, nihil ex Scriptura, imo ne ex patribus quidem, qui ante Synodum nicenum floruerunt, quicquam certi demonſtrari poteſt*, That nothing certanly can be made appear „ concerning the beginings of the Church of Alexan„dria from Scriptur, no not from the Fathers who flo„riſhed before the council of Nice. *Baronius* (Anno. 44. 11: 42.) ſaith *cum Apoſtolorum nomine tam facta quam ſcripta reperiantur eſſe ſuppoſitia, &c.* „ ——— Since there are ſuppoſitious both words „ and Acts under the Apoſtles name, & ſince what is „ related by true writers, remaines not incorrupt, it „ may make one diſpair to reach that is true and cer-

certain. So much is the great popish historian forced to confess.

The *Informer* should likewise have done well to have put into the mouth of his *doubter*, Joseph Scaliger, his grave difficulty about the succession of the Bishops of the Church of Jerusalem. (Related by *Didocl.* Cap: 4: p. 123.) Wherin he proves *Eusebius* relation to be contrary to our Lords prophecy anent the destruction of Jerusalem, and to Josephus his History. To this I add, that he will find many learned men doe hold, that the first successors after the Apostles in these supposed Catalogues, were meer Presbyters, [who according as they were more eminent in the Churches, and consequently their memories reserved therein, whose *Natales* (as *Junius* speaks) that is their dayes of banishment, martyrdome, or death were keept in the Churches records; accordingly they were cull'd out by the Fathers to fill up these Catalogues, though they were contemporary, & those they named [Bishops], in conformity to their own times. For this I recomend *Franciscus Junius* his learned discourse to this purpose Cont. 3: l. 2: c. 5. not. 18 — [*errori causam prebuit*, &c. *the cause of the error* (he means in those contradictory confuted Catalogues of Bishops) *was, that there were many Bishops or Presbyters at once appoynted by the Apostles in the Churches &c.*] Its then evident (which is the Collection of *Diocl.* upon what is premised) 1. That the Ancientes without examination having from their progenitors receaved many fabulous stories, delivered to the posterity such thinges as can neither be reconciled to Scripture, nor with themselves.

2. That they might fill up their Tables of Bishops, and conforme the first ages to their own, they culld out the most famous Minister for zeal, piety &c and put

put them into their Catalogues. 3. Whom they thus put in, they called them [*Bishopes*] in conformity to their own times, though they were [meer Presbyters.] For (as we saw upon Phil. 1.) himself acknowledges, that the Fathers used the names indifferently. So by this time wee suppose it is convinceingly evident, that our *Informers* great argument from his Testimonies is lost.

There is a great consent of the learned in this „that „for the first purest age, the Church was governed by „Presbyters. without Bishopsblondel (Apol: Sect: 3: p: 3: 14. 3: 5 —— p. 308: 378.) Shewes the consent of the learned heerin. For this Church of Scotland, we have the Testimony of *Ioanes Major* (de Gest. Scot: l. 2.) of *Fordon* (Scoto-chronicon, lib. 3. Shap. 8.) likwise of Blond. (Sect. 3.) All shewing, that this nation (haveing imbraced the Christian faith Anno. 79.) till the year 430. (When the pope sent *Palladius* as our first Bishop,) *was governed only by Presbyters with out Bishopes*; so that we had our union to the see of Rome together with Prelacy. *Clemens*, of the first century, in his Epistle to the Philippians, maks „but two orders of Ministery, „ *Bishops* and dea- „cons, these only he sayes the Apostle set up to pro- „pogat the ordinances to believers. And this to be a „remedy to end all contests about Episcopacy. (page. 57. &c.) The same we heard of *policarp* (in his Epistle to the Philippianes) we heard of Augustins Testimony (Epist. 19. to Jerom.) *Dr. Reynolds* (in his Epist. to Sr *Francis Knolls*) cites *Chrysostom*, *Jerom*, *Ambrose*, *Augustin*, *Theodoret*, and many others ancient and modern, to prove, that in Scripture, Bishop and Presbyter are all one. Jeroms Testimony upon Titus, is famous for this point, who asserts, and proves at large, from Philip. 1. Act. 20. Hebr. 13: 17. 1 Pet. 5. That by Gods appointment, and in the first

„ first Apostolick times & afterward, the government „ was by Presbyters, *communi concilio Presbyterorum*, [by „ the common councel of Presbyters.] that by divine „ appointment, Bishops & Presbyters are one, that the „ difference betwixt them had no better ground then „ *contudo* or *Custom*. That divisions by Satans instinct oc- „ casioned the difference afterward made betwixt Bi- „ shop and Presbyter. That their equality was not his „ privat Judgement, but *a Scripture truth*. The same he hath in his Epistle to *Evagrius*.

But now let us hear what our *Informer* hath Scraped together from his masters. *Saravia*, *Dounam*, *Tilen*, „ &c. To infringe this Testimony. 1. He sayes [That „ *Jerom* speaks onely of the first gospel times, when „ mentioning the identity of Bishop and Presbyter, „ when the Apostles did by their own presence & indu- „ stry Supply the rowme of Bishops, but as they began „ to fail by death, or their busines called them elswhere „ and upon the Churches inlargement, & the Schisme „ that arose upon the Presbyters equality, Bishops were „ set up over Presbyters. This he proves, because, „ *Jerom* saves, that *from Mark the Evangelist*. The Pres- „ byters choosed out one, and called him *Bishop*, even „ to the Bishops *Heraclius* and *Dionisius*, but Mark died „ before Peter and Paul. Then he compleans of *Sme-* „ *ctimnius* as dealling defectively in leaving out this in „ their Citation — And of Mr. Durham (on the Revel. „ pag. 225.) and that Mr. Durham takes no notice of *je-* „ *roms* similitud in speaking of this Election of Presby- „ ters in relation to their Bishop, viz, *As the army doth choose the Emperor*] Thus far we have our *Informers* first great defence, Which brings to minde a remarkable saying of *Marcus. Anton. De Dom. De repub Eccl. lib. 2. cap. 3. Numb. 46. Sunt qui Hieronimum in rectam sententiam vel invitum velint trahere. ille tamen dum consuetudini Solæ ecclæsiasticæ, ecclæsiæque humano decreto tribuit quod*

*quod ab Apoſtolis jure divino, eſt factitatum, aliquantum certe deflexit — neque in hoc aut excuſari poteſt, aut in alium contrarium ſenſum trahi verba ejus, neque aliam Sententiam neque defenſionem neque excuſationem, admittentia* „ *ſunt hæc in Epiſt. ad Titum: &c* „ Some would (he „ ſaith) draw *Jerom* to a contrary minde againſt „ his will, but whil he doth aſcribe only to *Eccleſiaſtick Cuſtome*, and the *Churches humane decree*, what was „ done by divine right, he went out of the way, and „ in this he cannot be excuſed, nor can his words admitt of any other ſenſe, or meaneing. So much was this mans ingenuity beyond that of our *Informer*. But to the point. I *Anſ.* 1. Wee have nothing here but the old Song, which hath been anſwered by many. *Iunius* [*de cler*: c. 15. Not. 16.] tells him [That *tria diſtinguit tempora Hieronimus. Primum, quo Eccleſiæ communi presbyterorum concilio gubernabantur. Secundum quo ſtudia in religione facta ſunt, ac dictum eſt in populis, ac non corinthi ſolum &c: nam quum primum illa corinthi dicerentur, adhuc communi presbyterorum concilio eccleſiæ gubernabantur, ut patet ex 1 cor. 5. & 2. cor. 1. tertium demum quo unus de presbyteris electus cæteris fuit ſuperpoſitus. Atque hæc ſingula tempora ſuam, ut cum vulgo loquar, latitudinem habuerunt. Ierom* „ diſtinguiſhes, Three periods of time. 1. When the „ Church was governed by the Common Council of „ presbyters. The 2d. Wherin there were diviſions in „ religion, and it was ſaid among the people, not at „ Corinth onely; I am of Paul &c: for when theſe „ things were ſaid at Corinth, the Church (ſaith he) „ was as yet governed with the Common Council of „ presbyters, as it appears 1. Cor. 5. and 2 Cor. 1. „ The 3d. and laſt, wherin one choſen out from among „ the presbyters, was ſet over the reſt. And every „ one of theſe times (ſaith he) that I may ſpeak with „ the vulgar, hade their own latitud. here in this one judicious account of this learned author, our *Informer* might

might have ſeen his error, and the violence which he offers to *jerome* words for *jerom* drawes his proofes for the firſt period from many texts of Scripture, from Phil. 1. Act 20. &c when Paul took his laſt farewell of that Church, never to ſee their faces more. Yea he drawes his proofes from John the Surviver of all the Apoſtles, for the identity of Biſhops and Presbyters, and in relation to the Churches being governed by their Common Councill. And as to the choiſe of the conſtant preſident he addes *quod autem poſtea unus electus*, that their was one *afterward* choſen to preſide, for the remedie of Schiſm &c, and to be *Epiſcopus preſes*, this period he fixes after Iohns time, and ſo after all the Apoſtles.

2. Wheras the *Informer* (following *Downam defenſ* lib. 4. cap: 3. Sect: 10.) alledges, „ That the Preſbyters in „ jeromes ſenc did in the beginning of the goſpel go„ vern the Churches [*Modo privato*], in a privat way, & [in „ foro conſcientiæ] feeding with the word and Sacra„ ments; the Apoſtles themſelves, by their own preſenc „ ſupplying the roume of Biſhops; and that there„ after Biſhops were ſet up by them to prevent ſchiſm „ among Presbyters. I anſwer. He will aſſoone ſquize water from a flint, as this meaneing out of *jeroms* words. For *jerom* ſpeaks of a frame of government, yea a divine frame, which *poſtea and Paulatim*, *afterward and by degrees*, came to be altered and changed: but this privat government of Presbyters *in foro interno*, *was never changed*. 2. *jerom* in ſpeaking of that government which was afterward changed, and by degrees, proves its divine right from many ſcriptures as a *Diſpoſitio divina*, or *a divine appointment*. Now I beſeech him, did the Apoſtles firſt practiſe a divine frame of Government, and then changed it into a *human cuſtome*? (which is the Character that *jerom* puts upon the Epiſcopacy which afterward came in.) will any of com-

common sense or discretion, say so? Far less so learned a man as *Jerome* was.

3. If the Apostles themselves did supply the roum of Bishops, before the change which *Jerome* speaks of, then *Jerome* could not say of that period of time before the change, that, *communi consilio Presbyterorum ecclesiæ gubernabantur*, *the Churches were governed by the common Council of Presbyters*, but according to this gloss of his words, before the change, the Government was episcopall. But so it is, that jerom sayes, *idem episcopus & Presbyter*, *the Bishop and Presbyter are one and the same*, by *divine right*, and that before the change which came in by *a human custome* (which he distinguishes from that *dispositio divina* or *divine frame*, which first took place) the Presbyters Governed the Churches by common Counsel, according to *divine appoinment*. 4. If the Apostles upon their with drawing, or the increase of Churches, set up Prelats, let the *Informer* shew me why and how *Jerom* could draw his proof for the identy of Bishopes and Presbyters, from Act. 20. Where Paul was taking his last farewell of the Churches? was he to supply the roume of a Bishop by his presence with them, when never to see their faces more? how could *Jerome* plead for the divine right of Presbyters Episcopal, Scriptural, Gospel Government, from Paules calling them *Bishops* at his last farewell, and *committing the wholl Government to them*, if this had been his meaning? Besides, were not the Churches increased at this time? why then were not Bishops set up, since this man holds the increase of Churches to have grounded such a necessity of Prelacy? Nay, since Jerom drawes his proofes against the Prelats divine right, from the 1 Pet. 5, And from John, could he suppose that this was but *the beginning*, while the Apostles had the power still in their own hand? Againe, our *Informer* would doe well to resolve this doubt, how Jerom could call a Government which he asserts to be brought in by the Apostles

according to Gods appointment, *a humane custome opposite to the Lords appointment*? Or how could this answer Jeroms scope, [*to prove Presbyters to be one with Bishops*] to say that the Apostles first governend them, episcopally themselves, and then set up Bishops over them? And how will he make this correspond with what Jerom sayes as to the originall of this change viz. *the studia in religione*, or *factions in Religion*? Will the *Informer* say (which is his own argument afterward) that the Apostles immediat episcopall Government, had influenc upon this Schism? Was not likwayes the Schism at Corinth, (from which this man drawes the change in Jeroms sense) long before severall of Jeroms proofes from 1 Pet. 5 Act. 20 And from John, for the divine warrand of this common Government of Presbyters? And was this the change which *Jerom* speaks of, as *toto orbe decretum, & postea*, or *a change afterward through the World*: *Appage inneptias.*

2. As for what he adds, *That Ierom drawes the Alexandrian Episcopacy from Marke which he compleans that Mr. Durhame and Smectimnuus take no notice of. Ans.* Wee have shown already, that it is not worth the noticeing in this matter, and any notice can be taken of it, makes rather against him, then for him *for* if *Marke* was ane Evangelist in the strict sense, as *Ierom* calls him, he doeth (as *chamier* answers *Bellarmin* in this point) cut him of from the *Series* of *Bishops* properly so called. The *Informer* must grant this, or contradict what he said before of the inconsistency of these offices in a strict senc, in on and the same person; for he said nothing against this consequenc, *Timothie is called ane Evangelist in a strict sense*, ergo *He could not be a Bishop.* Now I say *Ierom* calls *Marke ane Evangelist*, for he tells us that *a Marco evangelista* from *Marke the Evangelist*, the Presbyters at Alexandria set up one to preside. Ergo he speaks exclusively, and cannot put *Mark* among the series of them

them, for *Mark* was ane officer of a higher nature. Moreover, the *Informer* tells us, that *Mark* died before Peter and Paul; hence I infer againſt him, *ergo*, *Ierom* could not reckon *Mark* among theſe Biſhops of Alexandria: for *Ierom* drawes his proofes for the Preſbyters divin right of governing in Common, from Act. 20. phil. 1. 1. Pet. 5. And from Iohn the laſt of the Apoſtles, and maks this divine Presbyterial government run along all the Apoſtles time, and tells us that the Biſhops who were ſet up, came in *by cuſtome*, and *afterward*, and *by degrees* when it was *toto orbe decretum*, decreed through the world; to put the power upon one; *ergo* theſe Biſhops of Alexandria behooved to be ſett up long after Mark was in his grave, according to *jeroms* calculation. And wheras he compleans that *Mr Durhame* leaves out that Clauſe [Where *jerom* maks uſe of a ſimile anent the armies chooſing ane Emperor —— That he may make the Biſhops power when brought in, as little as can be.] Its anſwered, that paſſage will as little help him as the other, for *jeromes* ſcope is, to ſhew That the Biſhops firſt riſe and power over Presbyters, *was by their own free election*, *not by divine diſpoſition*, as the Army chooſes the Generall. Now no ſimile muſt be ſtrained and hold in every poynt, elſe it were not a ſimile. Scripturparables themſelves muſt not be ſtrained beyond the ſcop. And beſides, *jerome* cannot be ſuppoſed to give at that time, even *de facto*, far leſs *jure divino*, an Imperial or Lordly power to theſe Presbyters thus choſen out by their brethren, and made Biſhops over them, unleſs he would Croſs his own doctrine, ſince he maks this choic and Election of the *Epiſcopus preſes*, to be the *humain Cuſtome*, poſterior unto, and different from *the divine appointment* of governing in a parity, which firſt took place. Likewayes *jerom* ſayes in his own time *quid facit excepta ordinatione Epiſcopus, quod non facit Presbyter*. What doth the Biſhop except ordina-

tion which the Presbyters doth not. So that they had not then arrived at any imperiall power.

And becauſe this man tells us even *ad nauſeam* of this paſſage, *a Marko Evangeliſta*. I will turn here the weapons point upon him, and demand, Since *Ierome* make theſe Alexandrian Biſhops from *Mark*, to have been ſett up *by Presbyters free election*, how comes the Prelats he pleads for, to be *Elected and ſet up at Court*, while the poor Creatures, *the Curats*, over whom they are ſet, to play the little emperoures, have no more Intereſt as to their choice and Election, then the ſillieſt *Monck* in chooſing the *pope* I add here, that this ſuppoſition of his [that *Ierom* holds the Apoſtles to have ſupplied the Biſhops rowme for a time, though no fixed ordinary Biſhops, untill the Churches growth, and their neceſſary abſence, did neceſſitat to ſet them up for preventing ſchiſm,] will Croſſe what himſelf and Downam alſo doe plead. *defenſ.* l. 4. c. 5. Sect. 3. (If at leaſt they will not make *Ierome* oddly to contradict himſelf, viz.) that *Ierom* [in *Catal. Scrip. Eccleſ.*] holds that Iames immediatly after the Lords ſuffering, was Conſtitut Biſhop of *Ieruſalem*. Beſids that neither of them will prove that to be the true *jerom*.

But now the *Informer* will reſolve the *great doubt* „ againſt what he hath ſaid, viz. „ That *Ierome* proves „ from Scriptur, Biſhop and Presbyter to be all „ one and that ſchiſmes by Satans inſtinct, ga„ ve occaſion to change the government from the „ Common Council of Presbyters, to another „ mould of ſetting up one over the reſt, to whom „ the whole Care ſhould belong &c. To which he „ anſwers, that *Ierom* ſpeaks of the power which Bi„ ſhops in his time had come unto beyond what the „ firſt Biſhops had, viz. That at the firſt Presbyters „ had a hand in government, but after, *omnis Eccleſiæ „ cura ad unum delata*, that is, the wholl care was put „ upon the Biſhop. But if we take *Ierom* to ſpeak of

„ the

„ the first introduction of Bishops, then he must be „ understood as speaking of the Apostles own times. *Ans.* 1. Upon this ground the *Informer* must grant, that in *Ieroms* sense, Bishops who only in ordination, were superior to Presbyters, had a greater power then the Bishops first set up by the Apostles; which will clearly exclud his diocesian Prelats, who have sole power in ordination and jurisdiction, as no divine Bishops. And Next, it will follow that the ishopes set up-*a Marco*, or after *Mark*, were meer presidents, or Moderators; since they were less in power then these Bishops, who onely in ordination, differed from Presbyters. So we see the rebound of this answer will strik his cause dead. And he must feel another rebound of his own blow, as to his Complaint of our leaving out what maks against us in *Ieroms* words. For I ask why he leaves out here *Ieroms* scripture proofes, evincing that Bishops & Presbyters are one *jure divino*? Why leaves he out *Ieroms* Collection upon all these scriptures (which runes along the through Apostolick age) viz. *That the Bishops are more by Custom, then by any true dispensation from the Lord set over Presbyters*? for although he after bringes in this as ane objection, yet it ought to have been set downe here, as the main conclusion of *Ieromes* arguing: and his testimony is very blunt without it. Again, how comes he thus to disguise what *Ierome* sayes of Presbyters governeing [*Communi Councilio*], or by common Councill, as if it Imported no more, then haveing *a hand in government*, which he maks Compatible with prelacy, wheras *Ierom* maks it distinct from, and anterior unto, even the first human prostasy. Beside, their governeing, *Communi Concilio*, Imports particularly, their joynt decisive suffrage in government; which he doth but meanly expres by *their governing in Common*. 2. What a rediculous conceit is this *That Ierom speaks of the power of Bishops in his time, beyond the*

*first Bishops Ierom* speaking of Presbyters expressly, as contradistinct from Bishops, and of the Presbiters existent in the Apostolick Churches, while the Apostles were alive, as himself just now explained it, in saying [that the Apostles by their presence and industry supplied the want of Bishops over these Presbyters.] So that he compares not the Bishops in his time, with the first Bishops who came in by Custome, but these *humane Bishops* who thus came in, with *the first scripture Bishops*. we know not wher to find this *versatil proteus* in his answers here, and may truely alleadge, that this Testimony pinches him and his fellowes.

*Next*, will he stand to this exposition of *Ieroms* „ words, which he here offers, viz, „ [That the „ first Bishops admitted Presbyters to governe with „ them, and the after Bishops in *Ieroms* time, go- „ verned alone.] Then he must grant, that the first and second Bishops, were of very different cutts; and so he breaks his Argument from the Catalogues, all in peeces; and must grant that the word *episcopus*, or *Bishop*, is variously used by the ancients, And that our present Lord-prelats can receave no *Pratrociny* from Bishops of the first ages, wherein Presbyters governed by common Council, and had a decisive sufferage in Government; whereas the Prelats now are beyond what their predecessors had come unto, even in *Ieroms* time: For then except ordination, the Bishop did nothing, beyond what the Presbyter might doe, whereas our present Prelats are sole both in ordination and Jurisdiction, and assume a negative voice in Church Judicatories, Yea a decisive suffrage in Parliament: which he dare not say that any of these Bishops did ever pretend unto.

Well, „ But if we shall say that *Ierom* speaks of the „ first introduction of Bishops into the Church, then „ (he tells us) *Ierom* must understand it of the Apo-

stles

„ stles times. What means he by the *first introduction of Bishops*? Can he give the least shaddow of reason for it, that *Jerom* speakes of any other introduction then that introduction of *human custom*, which he distinguishes from *the divine appointment* of Presbyterian paritie? But how proves he [That *Jerom* maks Bishopes to have been introduced in the times of the Apostles] (yet I must tell him by the way, that introduceing them *in the times of the Apostles*, is one thing, & *by the Apostles*, is another thing. *Diotrephes* sought his primacy in Iohns time, but was disowned by him therin. So that if we can prove that what *jerom* cites for the parity of Bishops & *Presbyters* jure divino, will conclud the point, these Bishops are in themselves, & in jeroms judgement, condemned by the Apostles.) his 1. *Reason* is [That *jerom* makes the thing, which gave occasion to this Introducing of Bishops, to be *the peoples saying I am of Paul and I of Apollo*, and this was the Schism spoken of 1 Cor. 1.] But this notion of *Saravia*, and others, he might have found long since answered. *Ieromes* scop is evidently, to prove that by Scripture warrand, *Bishop* and *Presbyter* are all one, wich he clears by many Scripture Testimonyes, even to Iohns time; and therefore he could not be so brutish, as to make this Schism at Corinth, the occasion of the Change, so long before Johns Testimony, yea before Paules farewell Sermon to the Elders of Ephesus, from which he drawes another of his proofes. But he speakes of *a human Custom* comeing in *Paulatim*, *postea*, peece and peece and by degres, long after these times: and but *alludes* unto that Division 1 Cor. 1. Expressing it *in the Apostles words*, not *of their times*; for the Apostles never appointed this prelatik excrescent power of Bishops over Presbyters as a remedy of Schisme, among all their prescriptions of the Cure of this evill. Rom. 16. 7. 1 Cor. 3: 3, 11, 18. Moreover famous

*whittaker* will tell him, *that this remedie is worſe then the diſeaſe.* The miſtery of iniquity was then working; the Apoſtles therefore would not lay a ſtep under Anti-Chriſts foot, to get in to his Chair. Beſides, theſe factions in religion were not at Corinth onlie. *Iunius* (*de cler.* Cap 15. not 16.) will *Informe* him that [*Jerom* aſſerts not, that it was ſaid at Corinth, I am of Paul, &c. *But among the people, &c. malum non Corinthi ſolum, &c.* It was a Publick evill —— Paul himſelf preſcrybed no ſuch remedy (ſaith he) unto the Corinthians. —— and afterward [Not. 17.] „ Jerom ſaith, after it was ſaid among the people, „ he ſaith not that this human Proſtaſia, began *at* „ *that tyme, viz*, of the ſchiſm, but *after that time.* „ Compare it with *Wittaker*, (de pont. Q. 1. c 3. „ Sect 29. [he ſaith not, it was decreed by the Apo„ ſtles, that one Presbyter ſhould be ſet over the „ reſt, this he ſayes, was by *the Churches Caſtome*; „ not the *Apoſtles decree* —— Then he adds (*Jerom, „ viz*,) *Let the Biſhops know, that it is rather „ by Cuſtome, then the divine appointment, that „ they are ſet over Presbyters.* Had the Apoſtles „ changed the firſt order, and ſet Biſhops over „ Presbyters, and forbidden the Churches to be „ governed by the Cammon Council of Presby„ ters, truly that had been *the Lords appointement*, „ becauſe proceeding from the Apoſtles of Chriſt, „ unleſs we will aſcrib to Cuſtom, not to divine „ appointment, what they decreed. But the Apo„ ſtles being alive, there was nothing changed in „ that order; for this Epiſtle was written when Paul „ was in *Macedonia*, &c.] Let our *Informer* read this learned author, who at large will cure his error in this poynt, if it be not incurable. Wheras he adds „ [That *Jeroms* comment upon Tit. 1. Imports only „ his opinion, anent the *Communiey of names* of „ Biſhop and Presbyter not *of their office* at that time]

Ibe-

I beſeech him what will this ſay to *Jeromes* ſcope, which is to prove Presbyters ſuperiority to Deacons? for the *deacons* name was in a generall ſenſe, attributed both to Apoſtles, and to the Evangeliſt Timothey, as himſelf pleads. Beſides, what ſignifies *Jeroms* inference from all his Citations, *viz*, [*That Bishops had not their ſuperiority over Presbiters, by divine appointment*] If only a communitie of names, was his proofe from theſe texts.

The *Informers* 2 Reaſon, to prove that *Jerom* makes Bſhops, to be introduced in the times of the Apoſtles, is [„ That had the decree wich *Jerome* ſpeaks „of, been after the Apoſtles, it would have been „extant in antiquity, where, and in what Council, „it took place, but this is not found. *Anſ Jerome* by, *toto orbe decretum*, or *proſpiciente concilio*, cannot mean any formal Council, either in the Apoſtles times, or afterward. But the meaning is, that when through the world, it was ſaid among the people, I am of Paul, &c. It was decreed among the people, or in, and among particular Churches, through the whole word, that is, *diſtributively*, though all places of the world, not *repreſentatively*, in any *œcumenick Council* of the whole world. *Decreed through the whole word*, is all one with, *Decreed by the whole world*, which is diſtributily to be taken. *Jeroms* words convince this, for the Councils decree, repreſenting the world, would be *all at once*; but *Jerom* ſayes this Change came not in *Simul & Semel*, but *paulatim by degrees*; And that the *Proſtaſia* came in *by Cuſtome*, which points at *a graduall comeing in*. Beſides, the Apoſtles changing the firſt mould of government, to prevent Sciſm, will ſay they made themſelves wiſer then the Lord.

His 3 Reaſon is [*That this will ſuppoſe the worlds univerſal defection, from the Apoſtolick Government, againſt which there is no footſtep of a Teſtimony.*] *Anſ.* we

We have seen (as he cannot deny) as great, and more sudden changes of the divine institutions, exemplified in Scripture; and that ane universall defection, hath been through the Christian world, from both the Apostolick Doctrine, and Government, he will not deny: and many Testimonies there might have been against this, though they have not come to our hands. He knowes how our divines answer such a Question of the Papists, as to the beginnings of their Corruptions, and their universall spread. Moreover, this mistery of Iniquity, and affectation of primacy, *began in the Apostles owne time*, and therefore we need not wonder that it spread shortly thereafter. *Jerome* tells us that this change was *Paulatim*, by degrees, and upon specious pretences of order and union, and therefore it is no wonder that this monster in its nature and dreadfull effects, was not seen at first.

„His 4t. Reason is „[That *Jerom* makes this „change to have been *for remedy of Schism*, and it „is „absurd to say, that *the Government of the Apostles* „*was lyable to this evil* But this inconvenience is salved, „if we say, that the Apostles for preventing Schisme „which parity breeds, set up Bishops over Pres„byters.] *Ans.* 1. To begin at his last part, he eschews not this inconvenienc himself; for he makes the Apostles to have Governed the first Curches Episcopaly, keeping the Episcopall reyns of Government stil in their owne hand (in *Jeroms* sense) till their absenc and Schism procured that change which *Jerom* speaks of. So that, with him, the root of Schism was sown in that Church which they Governed Episcopally; the Presbyters with him, ab initio, yea first or last not haveing a power of ordination, and jurisdiction; and he maks *jerome* to reflect upon the Apostles, as if they had

had bettered Chriſts appointment, as to Government: I pray him, how grew up the Corinth Sciſm while Paul acted the Biſhop over that Church? as he and the reſt of his party doe plead. The men of his way ſay that the Apoſtles keept the reyns of Government in their own hand, until they were about to die, before wich time there were ſchimes in their Churches. Did not the Apoſtles foreſee this? and if the Apoſtolick Epiſcapacy was by lyable to ſchiſmes, much more that of their ſubſtituts. 2. It is too groſs ane Inferenc to ſay that [ „ Becauſe *Ierome* holdes that for preventing „ ſchiſmes which were at that time, the Government „ was changed, therefore *Ierome* charges it upon the „ Apoſtles Government,] he may as well ſay, that a mans aſſerting Corruptions to be in the Church, will infer his imputing them to the ordinances. Was there nor diſcord among the diſciples, under Chriſts own immediat Government? but did that reflect upon his Holy Government that this recorded? Did not Paul and Barnabas divid & part aſunder? but did Luke in relating this, Charge it upon the holy Apoſtolick Government. 3. The abſurd [*reflexion upon the Apoſtles Government*] which he ſpeaks of, lyes upon his party, and theſe who firſt brought in, and now (after its evil effects are diſcovered) uphold this hierarchy, which is ſo croſſe to the Apoſtolick parity. *Ierom* ſayes [they brought in this imparity for remedy of ſchiſme] but leaves the charge of [reflecting upon the Apoſtolick government] upon the Authores of this innovation, and upon its promoters ſtill it muſt ly.

„ His 5t. *Reaſon* is „ That *Ierom* in his writtings deri- „ ves Epiſcopacy as high as from the Apoſtles, making „ Iames Biſhop of *Ieruſalem*, Titus of *Crete*, Mark of „ *Alexandria*: and Biſhops, Presbyters and Deacons „ to be that which *Aaron* and the *levites* were in the old „ Teſtament. Then he adds, that if we make him con-

„ contradict himself, it must be with advantage to „ Bishops. *Ans.* Wee have heard already, that it is past doubt with many godly learned, that the Fathers used the terme *Bishop*, in a various and general sense, and spoke of the Apostles, and of extraordinary officers, after the mode and custome of their own times, wherein these offices and designations were prevalent. It is this *Informer*, who puts a contradiction upon *Ierome*, while he maks him assert Episcopacy to be set up by the Apostles, upon occasion of the Corinth Schism, in contradiction to his Scriptur proofes of the parity of *Bishop* and *Presbyter* from the Apostles doctrine, and brings him in here as asserting the Apostles, to have been formaly Bishops from the begining. Wheras our answer hath none of these inconveniences; and tho it were granted, that it is the true *Ierome* who asserts this of the Apostles (which we put this *Informer* to prove) yet we accommodat this with his other doctrine, by what is said of the æquivocall sense of the word. *Aaron* and the *Levits* authority might, in *Ieroms* judgement, be as to Church government in general, derived in the new Testament, and also as to a distinction of Church officers therein. But if he should alledge, that *Ierom* assimilats here, the one government and the other; he will mak him plead for a gospell Aaron and pope. In a word, *Ieroms* judgement, as to the divine right of Presbyterian parity, being so clear, and by him founded upon the Apostles writings; ought to preponderat any other general, or ambiguous expressions, anent Bishops; and as a rule, to expound the same, in the sense most suitable unto this his judgement: especialy since the Fathers usage of speech, as to Bishops, is thus general and ambiguous as is said.

„ But the *Doubter* objects to purpose „ [ That *Ierom* letts the Bishops know that they have their power, more

more by Custom, then by divine right] To this the *Informer* repones his recocted crambe againe viz, [*Ie-*
„ *rom* speaks of the power which Bishops in his time
„ were invested with, beyond the first Bishops ——
„ And that *Ierom* in that same Epistle expones [Con-
„ suetudo, or *Custom*] by [Apostolical tradition] ——
„ That if we understand him of *Consuetudo*, or cu-
„ stom after the Apostles, this will fasten upon him
„ a contradiction. That he sayes of the first Bishops,
„ who governed by commeune Council with the
„ Presbyters; that they differed onely from them in
„ ordination, but of these in his owne time, *ad unum*
„ *omnis cura delata*, the wole charge was put upon one.]
*Anſ.* As for this conceit, of *Ieromes* distinguishing here onely [*Bishops* of his own time,] from [these of the Apostles time,] we have confuted it already, and shown its absurdity, and that it is most crosse to *Ieroms* scope and words, who proves a compleat parity amongst Ministers, and ane identity of Bishop, and Presbyter, in *Name* and *thing*, *all alongst the Apostles times*, *and writings*, even to Iohn, the surviver of all the Apostles, So that it is most absurd to fancy him to speak of *Bishops in the Apostles timet.* The *Informer* offers but a grosse distortion of his words, for he sayes of the Bishop who differed only in ordination, from Presbyters: *quid facit*, *what doth the Bishop* except ordination &c in the present time, but of these who have all the Care, he sayes *Paulatim ad unum cura delata*, the wholl care was put upon one, in the preterit time, pointing out these who came in upon that schism, which, with the *Informer*, was in the Apostles time. The objection tells him, that *Ierom* applyes the Bishops mould whom this man calls [first Bishops] to [his owne time] when he sayes what doth the Bishop, except ordination &c: And haveing proved Bishopes and Presbyters to be all one, he sayes *Sciant*, that

is

is, *let the preſent Biſhops know*, that they have their power more by Cuſtom, then divine appointment. 2. As for *Ieroms* expounding *Conſuetudo* or Cuſtome, by *Apoſtolick tradition*, it receaves the ſame anſwer with what is ſaid, as to his calling *Apoſtles*, *Biſhops*. For with *Ierome*, *Apoſtolick tradition*, and *Eccleſiaſtick Cuſtom* are all one; as that inſtance clears anent the obſervation of *lent*, which he calls *Apoſtolica traditio*, or *Apoſtolick tradition*, writing to *Marcellus*, and yet writing againſt the *Luciferians*, he calls it *Eccleſiæ conſuetudo*, or *a Cuſtom of the Church*: therefore by Apoſtolick tradition, he meaned not *Apoſtolick appointment*, for this were ane *implicantia in terminus*, a flat contradiction, ſince he denyes this to theſe Biſhops, but only *Eccleſiaſtick Cuſtom*, upon which he ſayes their offic: was founded. The *Informers* 2d. *Anſwer* o this „exception is (*with Davenant*) „ That by [tru h of „divine appointment] *Ierom* meaned Chriſts expreſs „command, by [Cuſtom] the Apoſtles practiſe, begun „by them, and after continued. For prove- „ing this he adduces the Inſtance now given, anent „ *Ieroms* making [*Apoſtolick tradition*], and [*Eccleſiaſtick „Cuſtome*], all one. Hence he thus ſenſes the words, „ That Biſhops were brought into the Chu:ch, not „by Chriſts expreſs command, but by a Cuſtom, „introduced by the Apoſtles into the Church, and „continued in their Succeſſors. *Anſ.* 1. This fine conceit maks *Ierom* reflect oddly upon the Apoſtles, as if they taught one thing, and practiſed anothers for *Ierome* proves from their writings, that all along they make Biſhops and Presbyters one, Now if they in practice ſet up B ſhops diſtinct from Presbyters, what Harmony makes this? 2. He thus maks him reflect upon Chriſts expre's command, in relation to government, as if it were altered; and opon his government Apoſtolick, in ſaying that it was the ground

of

of schismes. How will this man guard against this, which he imputed to us before? 3. What will *Davenant* or he make of these Three periods of time in *Ieroms* discourse, observed by learned *Iunius* and others, to clear his words. 1. Presbyters and Bishops all one and governing by Common Council all the Apostles time. 2. Scismes arising. 3. *Paulatim* and *postea*, in process of time, and by degrees, a new mould of government *projected*, and *immutata ratio*, the order changed, as *Ambrose* saith to the same purpose. Now this gloss of his words, will make the Apostolick government and practise, not only the rise of scismes, but *to be Changed*, for a change its sure *Ierom* speaks of from the first order of government appointed by the Apostles; and making yet the Apostles practise in government *to continue*, the answer contradicts it self, as well as *Ierome*. As for the instance adduced, it cannot quadrat here in this place, when *Ierom* opposes thi *consuetudo* or *Custom*, unto *disposition of divine truth*. For the Apostles practise, seconded by their Doctrin, (as the *Informer* holdeth that both will parroniz prelacy) is most formal a divine appointment, and *their giveing unto the Churches what they receaved of Lord* in their commission; and therefore cannot with any shew of Reason, be apposed unto *a divine appointment*, as *Ierome* opposes this *Consuetudo*, or Custom. *In Fine.* How wil *Davenant* or he, separat and distinguish that which *Jerome* cites [Act. 20.] for the parity *of Bishop* or *Presbyter*, and to prove Presbyters their common joynt government, viz, [That Paul gave the whol Episcopal Charge to these elders in his last farewell as the Holy Ghosts Bishops, not noticing Timothy in the thing.] How will hee (I say) distinguish this from *ane Apostolick practice and a practice to be continued?* So that here was (in *Ieroms* sense) a Presbyterian *practice* of this great Apostle, a practice founding that Government and to be continued so.

But

But the *Informer* dismisses this discourse of *Ierom* with some remarkes. The 1 is „ That he speaks at least of „ ane Apostolick right, as in many other his writings, „ in relation to prelacy. *Ans.* wee have proved that *Ieroms* words in these 2 uo places menrioned ( the clearest account of his judgement in this mater, since he is disputing this point *ex professo*) doe evince the contrary. *his* 2. *Remark* is „ That suppose he makes Bishops later then the Apostles, yet he maks them needful to prevent Schism. *Ans. Ierom* onely Narrats *rem Gestam*, or the mater of fact, viz. The ground that moved to bring them in, but gives not his *approbation of it.* Besides, the *Informer* would take home his own argument here, and bewar of making *Ierom* reflect upon the Apostolick Government, and contradict himself, in approving of a government as a remedy of schism, which he disputs against from Scripture. *His* 3*d. Note* is [„ That *Ierom* submitted to Episcopacy; and that *Mr. Durham* sayes that *Aerius* was condemned for brangling this order to the hazard of union.] *Ans. Ieroms* keeping fellowship wi h the visible Church in his time (tainted with this Corruption, and which was but then are *embrio* o that *grown Monster* now among us,) is a poor argument to plead for the best and purest (and in so far the most considerable) part f Ministers and professo s in this Church, heir complying with a Scismatick backsliding party, introducing this Corruption after it hath been universaly cast out and vowed against, and the same may be said of *Aerius* Neither contradict wee *Ierom* in this, for he maks not prelacy necessary for keeping out shisme, as we have already told him, and we heard that learned *Whittaker* calls it a remedy worse then the Disease. Before he can mke either *Ieroms* practise heranent, or *Mr. Durhams* assertion as to *Aerius*, bear any conclusion against us, he must prove that the prelatick party are the onely visible organick Church

Church of Scotland, else *Jeroms* practise will fortify more the Presbyterians plea against him, for breaking down the wall of Gods house, and seperating from the Presbyterian Government of this nationall Church. But of this when we come to examine the third Dialogue.

## Chap. XIII.

*The difference betwixt our present Prelacy and the Ancient Episcopacy stated and evinced in* 12. *Instances. Hence all the* Informers *pleadings from Antiquity for our Prelats, is found a beating of the Aire and impertinent.*

Although this *Informer* would make the world believe, that our Prelacy is nothing discrepant from that of the ancient Bishops, yet there are many *remarkable differences* betwixt the one and the other, which renders all his pretences from antiquity meer words and winde.

1. In general its clear from a great consent of the learned, that the Bishop who first came in after the Apostolick age was nothing but *Episcopus preses* or *Moderator*, *and had no power of ordination and Jurisdiction above Presbyters.* This Moderator fixedly set up *durante vita*, during life; And Indued with a higher honour upon this ground, is *Beza's Episcopus humanus*, or *human Bishop*, whom he distinguishes from *the divine Bishop of Gods appointment.* *Ambrose* in his time, acknowledges [on 1 Tim. 3.] [That Bishops and Presbyters had *the same essentiall office and ordi-*

*nation.*] *Dr Reynolds*, in his conference with *Hart*, proves, that at first the Moderator or president among Ministers in their meetings, is he whom the Ancients in after times called *Bishop*. So he holds that the Bishop at his first rise was only the πρωτος or Moderator of the Presbytery. *Blondel* at large mantains the same, only he holds that the next in degree succeeded him when dead. Hence *Musculus* after he hath from the texts alledged by *Jerome*, proved *that* „ *Bishop and Presbyter are all one.* adds „ That „ thereafter Ambition begetting strifes about pre„ cedencie, one was set up to be Moderator in a fix„ ed orb. And least our *Informer* or any else alleadge, that prelacy therefore is necessary to prevent Schisme. This eminent light of the reformed „ Church adds. „ but whither that device of man „ profited the Church or no, the times after could „ better judge, and that the effects issueing upon it, „ dicovered, that it was not the Spirit of God his „ remedy to take away Schisme, but Satans project to „ destroy a faithfull Ministery. The same saith *Sadael* „ viz; that this difference betwixt Bishops and Mi„ nisters which was introduced to remedie Schisme, „ opened a gap to ambition. So *Dr Whittaker* haveing out of *Jerome* shewed [That faction occasioned the change of the Ancient Apostolick parity among Mi„ nisters,] —— adds — „ That many wise and „ godly men have judged the change and remedy „ more pernicious then the disease it self, which though „ at first it did not appear, yet experience after pro„ ved that it brought the Antichristian yoake upon the neck of the Church. See the *appendix* to *jus. divin. Minist. Evangel.* In which Testimonies of these great men we may observe two things. 1. That they admitt the first Bishops to have been nothing else but fixed Moderators. 2: That even this much they doe con-

condemne as a deviation from the first appointment, and as that which gave a rise to the Antichristian Tyranny. Now the difference and disproportion betwixt this *fixed Moderator*, and our present *diocesian erastian prelat*, is so plaine and obvious, that nothing further needs be said to clear it. Therefore his Argument from the Catalogues and those early first Bishops who tooke place in the Church, is pitifully claudicant as to a conclusion of the ancient Churches approbation of our Prelats.

To clear it further, its evident (if we lay weight upon the Judgement of the ancient Bishopes themselves in point of Church Government) that 1. They held not their consecration or ordination to be distinct from that of Presbyters, *Episcopi & Presbyteri una & eadem est ordinatio*. [That the Bishop and Presbyter have one and the same ordination,] we heard is *Ambrose* assertion.

2. No delegation of externall jurisdiction to Presbyters was acknowledged by the ancients. As it is by our new hierachical pleaders. The Prelatists hold that the Bishop is properly the [*Pastour of the whole diocese*,] and that all the Ministers thereof have but a derived precarius Ministry under him. so *Down.* (defens. lib. 2. c. 4. p. 67.) *Field.* (of the Church 56. c. 27) *Sarav.* (de trip. epis. p. 87.) *Spalat.* l. 2. c. 9 Num. 15. and yet Ambrose [on 1 Tim. 5] And Chrisostom [*Hom.* 17 on Matthew] calleth Presbyters expresly *Christi vicarios, Christs vicars. Cyprian.* [lib. 4. Epist. 8] sayes, *Dominum sacerdotes in sua eccl sia* —— &c: „ That the „ Lord condescended to elect & constitut to himself „ Priests in his Church. 3. The Ancients held that „ the power of externall jurisdiction was common „ with Bishops and Presbyters. *Ignatius* (in his Epistle to the *Trallians*,) Calls the Presbyters *senatum Dei, Gods Court, or Senat. Et non consiliarios solum, sed & assessores*

*Epiſcopi. not Councellours only* (as are our Curats, and ſcarſe that) *but the Biſhops aſſeſſors.* Irenæus. (lib. 4. Cap: 44.) Calls them *Principes*, Princes or Chieff. *Auguſtin.* (*Serm*: 86.) Calls the Brethren *ineremo*, *Patronos rectores terræ*, Patrones and Rectors of the Earth. *Chriſoſtom* expreſſly ſhews (on 1. Tim. 1, *Hom*: 11.) *Eccleſijs præſidiſſe ſicut Epiſcopi*, &c: That they preſided over the Churches as the Biſhops, and receaved together with them the office of teaching and governing the Church.

The homily begines thus, *poſtquam de Epiſcopis dixit, eoſque formavit, quidnam illos habere conveniat, a quo item abſtinere neceſſe ſit dictans, omniſſo interim Preſbyterorum ordine ad diaconos tranſiit. Cur id quæſo? quia ſcilicet inter Epiſcopum atque Presbyterium intereſt ferme nihil. quippe & Presbyteris Eccleſiæ cura permiſſa eſt: & quæ de Epiſcopis dixit, ea etiam Presbyteris congruunt*: that is, „ after he hath ſpoken of Biſhopes and formed them, „ injoyning what thinges it becomes them to have, „ and from what it is neceſſary they ſhould abſtain, „ omitting the mean whil the order of Presbyters, he „ paſſes over to deacones. Why ſo, I pray? even „ becauſe that betuixt a Biſhope and Presbyter there „ is almoſt no difference. Becauſe unto Presbyters „ alſo the care of the Church is allowed: and what he „ ſaid before concerning Biſhopes, the ſame thinges „ alſo do agree to Presbyters. I know he addes —— *Sola quippe ordinatione ſuperiores illi ſunt, atque hoc tantum, plus quam Presbyteri habere videntur.* „ That the Biſhopes „ only in ordination are ſuperiour to Presbyters. according to the latin interpretation followed by *Dounam*, and *Bilſon*, and by *Bellarmin* before them. But the more learned interpreters have obſerved that the greeke will bear a farr other ſence, τὴν γὰρ χειροτονίαν μόνην ἀτῶν ἀναββήκασι, καὶ τοῦτο μόνον δοκοῦσι πλεονεκτεῖν τὸς πρεσβυτέρυς *Sola enim ſuffragatione horum aſcenderunt atque hoc ſolo videntur Presbyteris injuriam facere.* that is, „ that onely „ by the Presbyters ſuffrage they have aſcended, (viz by

„ to this power) „ and in this onely they seem to do „ injury to Presbyters. The learned *Iunius* (*de cleric. cap. 7. not.* 611.) tels us that χειροτονια (*hic*) *Presbyterorum non Episcoporum; quod si* χειροτονια *est ordinatio, ergo Presbyterorum est ordinatio.* „ The hand suffrage, „ is here the Presbyters. but if it be meaned of ordi- „ nation, then ordination belonges to them. And having proved this construction & sence of the greeke from *Suidas*, he shewes that *Chrisost.* places not the difference in ordination betuixt the Bishop and Presbyter, but in this that the Bishopes *ascendunt supra Presbyteros in gradum* Ἐπισκοπῆς „ Doe ascend into there „ degree of Episcopacy above the Presbyters — al- „ though, becaus they stepp up by their suffrage, they „ seem to wrong them when they assume any power to „ themselves, who upon the ground of order, not of „ power, (*saith he*) are set over them by there owne suffrag. He also tels *Bellarm.* (*de clerie. ca.* 15. *not.* 29.) That granting his sence of *Chrysost.* Wordes, yet the Bishop ordained onely *signo & sermone* „ declaring the sacred „ institution or inauguration of the person ordained, „ but not *ordinatione veritatis*, or by the true ordina- „ tion which that signe represented. Some add, that if *Chrisost.* be thus understood in the sence of *Bellarm.* and his Episcopal sectators, he did not rightly expound his text, while distinguishing that which he acknowledges the Apostle makes one & the same. *Jerome* tels us of their common Government of the Churches together with the Bishops; from whom *Gratian* (*in decretis caus.* 16. *Quest.* 1 *cap.*) shewes that *Ecclesia habet senatum Presbyterorum* &c: *That the Church hath a senat of Presbyters without whose counsel the Bishop can doe nothing.*

2. We heard that these Ancient Bishops were sett up *by the Presbyters* as their fixed Moderator and had all their Episcopall power from their *free choice and election.* And that any prerogative which they had over Presbyters, they ascribe it to *Custom*, and to the Pres-

byters own choic, *consuetudini., non dominicæ dispositionis veritati*, to Custom not the truth of *divine appointment*, as Ierome speakes. Irenæus, (who lived ann. 180, lib 4. cap. 43) tells us that we must adher to those Presbyters, *qui successionem habent ab Apostolis, qui cum* Episcopatus *successione charisma veritatis acceperunt.* — Who have succession from the Apostles, and together with the succession of Episcopacy have the gift of verity. Ambrose (*in cap* 4. *Ephes.*) affirmes that — *non per omnia conveniunt &c.* — [the government in his time agreed not in al points with scripture] he means it of any excrescent power which the Bishop then had above Presbyters. And Augustine ascribes al his difference from Ierom (who was a Presbyter) unto *Ecclesiæ usus*, the Churches Custome, and grantes that in this onely *Episcopatus Presbyterio major est*, the Episcopacy is greater then the Presbyterat. (*Tom. 2. operum. Epist. 19. ad Hieron*) And Ierome holds (in his Epistle to Evagrius) *Primatum hunc Episcoporum Alexandriæ Primum cæpisse* „ *&c.* „ That this primacy of Bishops began first at „ Alexandria, and, *post mortem Marcæ Evangelistæ* „ — after the death of mark the Evangelist. And thus gives the lie to our *Informer* who would make us believe that it came from *Markes* personal practise and appointment while a live. he tels us also that it was [*paulatim*] & by slent degrees, that *omnis sollicitudo ad unum delata*, The episcopall care was put upon on. *Sozom.* (*lib. 1. cap. 15.*) calls it *civitatis consuetudinem* a custome which prevailed with other cites. 'tis remarkable, that by *Ephiphanius* confession (*Hæres 87.*) *non habuit Alexandria duos episcopos ut aliæ urbes.* „ Alexandria had not two Bishopes as other cities. But the *Informer* wil not dare to say, that our *Prelats* now have their power by Presbyters election as these ancient Bishopes

3. It is also clear, that in these first times when the *Episcopus præses* was set up, and for some ages afterward, not only the Presbyters *but the people also* had a great

great interest in their choice. *Cyprian* (*epist.* 68. —) speaking of the choice of Bishops sayes „ That *plebs* „ *maxime habet potestatem*, the people have mainely a „ power —— and that [*plebe presente*,] that is in „ the peoples presence, they were set up: Which he sayes was a power they had descending upon them *de divina auctoritate*, that is, from the divine Authority. And this had the approbation of ane *African Synod* consulted by the Churches of Spaine as to Election. *Athanas*: (*epist. ad Orthodox.*) condemned the comeing in of a Bishop without the peoples consent as a breach not only of ane [Ecclesiastick constitution,] but ane [Apostolick precept.] *See Smect*: (page 26.) proveing this at large that Bishops were elected by the people. *Cyprian.* (*lib.* 1. *Epist.* 4. *nomine Synodi africanæ*) *videmus, de divina authoritate descendere ut sacerdos plebe presente sub omnium oculis deligatur &c.* [That „ the Priest was chosen under the eyes of all the people „ being present, and approved as fitt and worthy by a „ publick Testimony.] This (he sayes) we see descends from divine Authoritie, & (ibid) *diligenter de traditione divina & Apostolica traditione tenendum est quod apud nos fere & per provincias universas tenetur ut episcopus deligatur plebi cui ordinatur presente &c.* [That it was to „ to be held from the divine and apostolick tradition, „ as almost through all provinces it was observed, that „ that the Bishop was chosen in the peoples presence „ over whom he] was ordained &c.] He testifies that thus *Cornelius* was chosen Bishop of Rome (*lib.* 4 *epist.* 2.) *Grat.* (dist. 62. Can) *nulla ratio fuit ut inter episcopos habeantur qui nec a clero sunt electi, nec a plebibus sunt expetiti.* „ No reason permitts that they should be holden Bis- „ hops, who are neither chosen by the clergy nor desi- „ red by the people.] So *Ambrose* was chosen by the citticens of *Millan*, *Flavianus* by those of *Antioch*, *Chrisostom*, by the *Constantinopolitans*. This Custome was so rooted, that when Emperors afterward obtru-

ded Biſhops without the previus election of the clergie and people, the moſt famous Biſhops much ſtomached it. *Ubi ille Canon*, (ſaith *Athanaſius Epiſt. ad ſolitariam vitam agentes*) *ut a pallatio mittatur is qui futurus eſt Epiſcopus.* Where is that canon, *That he who is to be Biſhop, ſhould be ſent from the court?* Let our court prelats mark this: And our curats anſwere this quere. Now I hope our *Informer* will not alledge that the people have any the leaſt Intereſt in the choiſe of our Prelats, ſo that they are but novell & none of the ancient Biſhops in this point.

4. Non of the firſt Biſhops *could ordaine alone.* This is beyond debate as to the firſt [*Epiſcopus preſes.*] But even in after times alſo when Biſhops power was farther advanced they could not thus ordaine.

That their power of ordination was not *ſingular* appeares from the „ 4th Councel of Carthage (*Can.* 22) „ which decrees that the Biſhopes ordain not without „ the Clergy; and [*Can.* 3.] they are not to impoſe „ handes without them.

The Presbyters in *Cyprians* time had the power *baptiſandi*, of baptizing, *manum imponendi*, or of laying on hands, *& ordinandi*, that is, of ordaining. (*epiſt.* 78.) and in Egypt, in abſence of the Biſhop they ordained alone. ſee *Smect.* (p. 27.) upon this ground *Ambroſe* ſaid, that betwixt the Biſhop and presbyter there is almoſt no difference. Now have not our prelats power to ordaine alone? and have they not *de facto* frequently done ſo? ſo that upon this account alſo they are new minted Gentlemen.

5. The power and Government of the ancient Biſhops in Church judicatories was [*not ſole and ſingular,*] as that of our prelats, [*nor did they invad or inhanſe their deciſive concluſive ſuffrage*] as they doe, who are Princes in all the preſent Church meetinges which muſt only give them *advice*, and not that, unleſs this

„ this high prieſt judge them of known loyaltie and „ prudence, and may doe with their advice what he pleaſes. Wheras *Cyprian* (Epiſt. 6. and 28) profeſſes that he neither „ *could nor would doe any thing* „ *without the Clergie.* And the 4t. councill of carthage condemnes the Biſhops deciſion unleſs „ fortified by the ſentence of the Clergie (Can. 23.) where was the negative voice here? ſee *Ruffin. hiſt. lib.* 10. *Cap.* 9. *Smectim.* proves from Canons of ancient Councills & the Fathers, That neither 1. In cenſuring presbyters. Nor 2. In judgeing of the converſation or crimes of Church members. Nor 3. In excommunication, „ nor receaving of penitents, „ *Biſhops could doe any thing without presbyters.* And *that there was no delegation of their power. Downam* himſelf confeſſes in reference to Ambroſe time, and long after it. So that for 400 Years our prelats preſent Prince like power was not known in the Church. The ancient Biſhops made themſelves ſole in no pointe of eccleſiaſtick diſciplin as our prelats, who have excommunicat alone. *Tertull.* (Apoleget.) ſhews that the exhortations, caſtigations, and *cenſura divina*, the divine cenſure among which he takes in excommunication, were performed by the *probati quique ſeniores, all the approved elders.* Befor him *Irænus* [*hæreſ:* lib: 4 cap. 44.] Will have theſe Presbyters obeyed. *Qui ſucceſſionem habent ab Apoſtolis*, „ have ſucceſſion from „ the Apoſtles — And that *ad correctionem aliorum*, for „ cenſure of others as well as for ſound doctrine. *Baſilius magnus Archiepiſc. Cæſarienſ.* affirms, that *jus ligendi & ſolvendi ὁμοίως ex æquo, omnibus paſtoribus & doctoribus &c.* „ That the power of binding and lowſing is equally and together given by Chriſt to all „ Paſtours and Doctors. Which even *Lombard* denieth not [*ſentent. lib* 4. *diſt.* 19.] It is alſo demonſtrated

that elaborat piece that the *oath ex officio* is a Monſter to Antiquity.

6. Our Prelats *Civil & State offices* are alſo a Monſter to pure antiquity, as they are Croſſe to our Churches Authority; who in her general aſſemblie hath condemned this. (*Aſſemb*: 38. *ſeſſ*: 25.) The forſaid author proves this alſo at large, to whom we refer the Reader, So that our *Informer* muſt acknowledge that our Prelats in this point alſo are different from the Ancients.

Whoſoever ſhal peruſe the *Canones* called *Apoſtolick*, and of ancient councels, will find Biſhopes „ medling in ſtate-affairs, and eſpecialy their holding „ of ſtate offices, ſo harmoniuſly condemned, that its a wonder that any who pretends to the knowledg of antiquity, and to plead for prelacy upon this ground, ſhould have the conſidenc to juſtify it,

The 6. *canon* of thoſe called *Apoſtolick* „ paſſes the „ ſentence of depoſition upon Biſhops who aſſume „ ſecular imployments. [Epiſcopus vel Presbyter, vel „ diaconus ſeculares curas ne ſuſcipiat, alioqui de- „ ponatur.] *Balſamon* upon this canon, referrs us to 13. cap. 8. Tit. Where there is exhibit a full collection of canons to this purpoſe. The 81 *canon. diximus non oportere Epiſcopum vel Presbyterum ſeipſum ad publicas adminiſtrationes demittere, ſed in Eccleſiaſticis negotiis verſari. Vel ergo ita facere perſuadeatur, vel deponatur.* „ That is, „ we have appointed that a Biſhop or Preſ- „ byter muſt not ſtoop to, or debaſe himſelf with pub- „ lick (that is, civil) adminiſtrationes or offices, let „ him therfor be either perſwaded ſo to do, or let „ him be depoſed. *Balſamon* upon this canon, obſerving that it lenifies the firſt, referrs to *XVI Canon Carth. Syn.*

Again *Canon* 83. runes thus, *Epiſcopus vel Presbyter, vel diaconus, exercitui vacans; & utraque obtinere volens, remanum ſcilicet magiſtratum, & Sacerdotalem adminiſtrationem*

*tionem, deponatur, quæ sunt enim cæsaris, Cæsari, & quæ sunt* „ *Dei, Deo.* That is, „ a Bishop or Presbyter or deacon „ who bears office in an army, and will needs hold „ both offices, to wit the Roman magistracy, and the „ sacerdotal administration or ministry, let him be „ deposed; for such things as belong to *Cæsar* must be „ rendred to *Cæsar*, and the things that are Gods unto God. *Balsamon* upon this canon refers us to VII. Can. chalced. syn. —— *tales* (saith he) *anathemate ferientem si non pœnitentiam agant* —— „ Which strickes them „ with [*anathema*] (the last extremest curse or excom- „ munication.) „ who assume military imployments „ and repent not. And having moved ane objection, whether the formentioned clause [*cesset vel deponatur*, let him leave off this office, or let him be deposed.] is here also to be understood, he tels us in the close of his answer, that *omnia publica eandem rationem habent*, „ that al publick civil offices fals under the same con- „ sideration as thus discharged. And begins his gloss upon this canon thus, *diversi canones Apostolici prohibuerunt sacris initiatos publica negotia administrare.* That is, „ diverse Apostolick canones have forbidden such as „ are entred into sacred functiones to handle or admi- „ nister *publick* (or civil) *affaires*. In the beginning of his gloss upon the 6 *canon*, he represents thus the crime of church officers holding of civil places which is censured therin *De hominibus consecratis qui seculares servitutes exercent &c*: „ concerning men consecrat to god „ who exercise wordly *slaveries*. —— such a Chara- „ cter do the Canons put upon our Prelates state offices. That VII. *Canon* of the Councel of *Chalcedon* puts the formentioned censur upon such as —— [*seculania negotia exercent divinum ministerium negligentes*] —— who manadge wordly places and offices neglecting the divin ministry.

The

The *XVI. Canon* of the second Council of Nice „ forbidding Bishops or presbyters to be ἐκλήκτορες, „ actores or procurators, doth it upon this ground. ——— *debent enim ad id quod scripsum est respicere nemo „ Deo militans seipsum implicat secularibus negotiis.* For „ they ought to take heed to that which is written no „ man warring for god, or who is his souldier should „ involve himself in secular affaires, see *Balsamon, comment. in Canon. Apost. concil. & patrum, & in Photii nomo can* pag. (mihi) 39: 108, 127, 178, 167, 319. Whence we may collect. 1. how constant and sever the ancients were in their censour of this guilt 2. That they held this to be a debasing of the holy ministry, to which the pastor or Bishop most give himself 3. That upon the „ ground of that gospel precept (2. *tim.* 2: 4.) „ *No man that warreth intangleth himself With the affaires of this life*, and that other ground *of giving Cæsar what is Cæsars, and to God what is Gods*, they do condemne, not military imployments only, in a Pastor or Bishop or taking farms (as our *Informer* would make us believe) but also *also all secular and civil offices without ex- „ ception* 4. That they held the sacred function of the ministry *to be utterly inconsistant with publick civil imployments.* And the civil office of a *state-ruler* incompatible with the *ministerial office*, in one and the same persone; since they are opposed & contradistinguished as thus inconsistant, in the forementioned Canones and the grounds thereof. So that there is not a shaddow of defence for prelates state offices. Whil these Canones do sit in judgement, especialy the scripture grounds hinted therein, and many others which have been adduced.

7. What ever generall expressions of the ancients he may plead, yet is it not certain, that in the first pure ages even after the [Episcopus humanus,] and the fixed presidents were set up, *the archbishops, primats, metropolitans*

*tropolitanes, were Monsters* and unknowne, yea even *the diocesian mould and cast of Churches*, let any peruse *Mr Bains*, his diocesians tryall against *Downam*, and this will be convincingly clear.

8. Where will the *Informer* shew us *our erastian prelacy* in all his antiquity? *A prelacy deryving all its power both of ordination and Jurisdiction absolutly from the civill Magistrat, having no intrinsick spirituall authority, and in all its administration, acting by way of deputation and commission from the Magistrat as accountable to him in every piece thereof immediatly and solely as other inferiour civil Gover-nours.* Dar he say that these Bishops in the first ages exercised not ane *inherent Ecclesiastick spiritual power, distinct from and independant upon the Magistrat*? Was all their meetings and all matters cognoscible in them, given up to be, *pro libitu*, disposed of by any Prince or potentat whither heathen or Christian? Did not all Ministers and Bishops of these times exercise ane Ecclesiastick independant authority, as being totally distinct from, and not a part of the civill Government? Was ever there *Erastian Government* heard of in the Christian World till *Thomas Erastus* of *Heidleberge* brotched it? And hath it not since that time been Impugned by the most famous lights of the reformed Churches as contrary to the Rules of the Gospell Church Government? So that our *Informer* must acknowledge the present *Ecclesiastico-civil*, or *linsy-wolsy-Prelacy* to be a speckled bird of new fasbioned coloures, never before seen, to which he will not find a paralleel among all the Fathers or Bishops of former ages.

9. Let me add, how will our *Informer* make it appear That in the first purer ages, any of the ancient Bishops *did deny & wholly exclud* [*ruling elders*] *from Church Judicatories*. We have proved this officer to be juris

divini

*divini* from Scripture. And the full consent of Antiquity, & also of reformed divines is abundantlie clear, & exhibit by many of the learned for the divine right of this officer. *Ambrose* is brought in compleaning of the disuse of these officers (on 1 Tim. 5.) As a *devation from the Scripture-patern, & proceeding from the pride & negligence of Doctors.* *Origin.* his Testimonie (*lib:* 3. *contr: Celsum*) is remarkable, who shewes that among the more polite hearers who were above the *Catechumenists* εἰσι τινες περιγενεσθαι, &c. *Non nulli præpositi sunt qui in vitam & mores eorem qui admittuntur, inquirunt, ut qui turpia committunt, eos communi cœtu interdicant, qui vero ab istis abhorrent. ex animo complexi meliores quotidie reddant.* „ There are some set over „ the rest who inquires into the life and manners of „ those who are admitted, that such as committ these „ things that are vile, they may discharge them from „ the publick assembly, and embracing from their „ heart such as are farr from these things, they may render them every day better. Here are censurers of manners found in the ancient Church, though not Ministers, and designed and constitut to their work with authority in their hand to interdict the scandalous, and what are these but ruling elders? So *Augustin* (Epist. 137.) writeing to his Charge directs it thus *dilectis fratribus, clero, Senioribus, & universæ plebi Ecclesiæ Hipponensis,* „ To the beloved brethren, the „ Clergie, the elders, and the wholl people of the Church of Hippo. So (*Contr. Cresc. Gramattic.*) *omnes vos Episcopi, Presbyteri, diaconi, & Siniores Scitis. All yow Bishops Presbyters, deacons and elders, doe know.* Here are Two sorts of elders mentioned in one *comma*, who can be nothing else but ruling elders. For the same purpose, the learned in handling this theam, doe cite Barronius (*Ann:* 103.) Where he enumerats *Episcopi, Presbyteri, diaconi, Seniores. Bis-*

*hops*

*hops, Presbyters, Deacons, Elders.* So also *Tertullian* (*Apolleget. adversus gentes c.* 39.) *Cyprian* (*Epist.* 39.) (*Optatus* (*lib.* 1. *p.* 41.) and many others. See *assertion of the governments of the Church of Scotland. Christoph. justell. observ. & not. in Cod. Can. Eccles. affric. p.* 110, 111. *jus divinum Regim. Eccles. Smectim. &c:*

10. *The Ancient Bishops were not set over whole provinces*, but city by city for most part, yea severall Cities had more, which sayes they were not at all Bishops properly. *Clemens* (*in Constit. l.* 7. *c.* 46.) shews that *Evodius* and *Ignatius had at once the Episcopacy over the Church of Antioch*, and what was this but a meer Collegiat Ministery. *Council. African* (Cap. 21.) appoints that to examine the cause of a Presbyter, *sex Episcopi ex vicinis locis adjungerentur, 6 Bishops from neighbouring places be adjoyned.* Poor dorps had their Bishops as is clear in *History. Nazianzon*, a little towne neer *Cæsarea*, yet was all the Episcopall See of *Gregory Nazianzen.* In *Chrysostomes* time, the dioceſs contained but one citie. *Homil.* 3. (*in acta*) *nonne terrarum orbis imperium tenet imperator &c.* [doth not the Emperour (saith he) Govern the World, but this man is a Bishop only of one city.] *Sozom.* (*Hist. Ecclesiast. lib.* 7. cap. 19.) Tells us that he found with the Arabians and those of Cyprus, Bishops in little Dorps.

11. *The Ancient Bishops placed* [*preaching*] *among the chief partes of their office*, and were not idle drones as ours are? *Theophilact.* on 1 Tim. 3. tells us that *docendi officium omnium precipue ut insit episcopis est necesse, that the office of preaching, which is the chieff of all others, its necessarie that the Bishop be indewed with it.*

As ours *Court-prelats*, so our *non-preaching Prelats*, are strangers unto, and condemned by the ancient Canons. *Photii Nomocan. tit.* 8. *cap* 12. [*de*

12. [*de Epiſcopis, qui non convertunt hæreticos, & de Epiſcopis & clericis qui non docent populum.*] he preſents and digeſts the *Canons* againſt Biſhops and clergy men *who convert not hæretiks, and teach not the people.* ſome of theſe Canones are as followes.

The 58. canon of thoſe called [Apoſtolick], runes thus, *Epiſcopus vel Presbyter, qui cleri vel populi curam non gerit, & eos pietatem non docet ſegregetur: & ſi in ſo-* „ *cordia perſeveret, deponatur.* „ The Biſhop or Preſ- „ byter who takes no care of the people or clergy and „ teaches them not piety, let him be ſet aſide: and if „ he continue in his folly let him be depoſed. *Balſamon* upon this Canon, tells us that, *Epiſcopalis dignitas in docendo conſiſtit, & omnis Epiſcopus debet docere populum pia dogmata &c:* „ The Epiſcopal dignity conſiſts „ in teaching, and every Biſhop ought to teach the „ people holy ſtatutes for the Biſhop is for this end „ eſtabliſhed to attend the people &c: therafter he ſhewes that the presbyters ought to be ſo imployed, *quia etiam prope Epiſcopos ſedent in ſuperioribus cathedris*, [becauſe they ſit beſide the Biſhops in the higher ſeats] they were not then the prelats underlinges as our curats are now; hence he concludes that the Biſhop or prieſt who neglected this duety, were to be ſet aſide, and if continuing, to be depoſed.

The 36. of theſe Canons puts this cenſour upon the Biſhop who neglects this duty, *Si quis ordinatus Epiſcopus non ſuſcipiat miniſterium & curam ſibi commiſſam ſit ſegregatus &c:* „ That the ordained Biſhop ſhal be ſet aſid „ ſured who goes not about his miniſtry and the duty „ intruſted to him &c. *Balſamon* expoundes this part of the Canon, and ſummes it up thus. *Decernit itaque præſens Canon, ut ſi quis Epiſcopus, vel Presbyter ad docendum pertinentem manuum impoſitionem acceperit, &* „ *ſuum munus non implea', ſegregetur.* „ The preſent „ Canon diſcerns that if any Biſhop or Presbyter hath „ received

*received imposition of hands relating to teaching, and fulfilles not his office, that he be set aside &c.* Where its evident that he makes the Bishops ordination, or imposition of hands, relative unto the great duety and office of preaching the gospel, aswel as that of the Presbyter, and accordingly expoundes the Canon.

The XXXIX. *canon* intrusts the Bishop *with the Charg of the peoples soules*, in correspondence with the preceeding. In the forecited cap: VII. *Photii*, we are referred to the *Syn. Carthag. can.* CXXIII. *Syn.* VI. *can.* XIX. LXIIII. See also Syn. Sexta in trullo can. XIX. *quod oportet eos qui praesunt Ecclesiis, in omnibus quidem diebus, sed praecipue dominicis —— docere pietatis & rectae rationis eloquia, ex divina scriptura colligentes intelligentias &c* „ That all such as are set over „ Churches, on all dayes, but especialy on the Lords „ dayes most teach the oracles of piety and pure religion, drawing instructions from the divine scriptures &c: *Balsamon* begins his commentary upon the canon thus, *Episcopi Ecclesiarum doctores constituuntur, & propterea dicit canon eis omnino necesse esse, eum cui praesunt populum semper docere, & multo magis in diebus dominicis* &c. That is, „ The Bishops are constitut teachers of the Churches, and therefor the „ canon sayes unto them, that its absolutely necessary alwayes to teach that people over whom they are „ set, and much more on the lordes dayes wherin all are „ almost present in Churches and artificers ceases „ from ther work &c. So that our non-preaching, or seldom preaching prelates, who by a new consecration (forsooth,) superadded unto their Presbyterial ordination to preach the gospel, get a bill of ease from this great duety, to act state games, except when their Lordships please to step into the pulpit, to supererogat, stands arraighned, stigmatized, and deposed by the ancient Canones, as unworthy of any

office in the houſe of god. *Vide can. Apoſt. conc. general. & partic. Sanct. Patr. Photii nomocan. cum Balſam. comment. pag.* (mihi) 39: 116, 117, 121, 207.

Unto this account and cenſure of antiquity, and of the ancient canons, paſt upon our non-preaching prelates, I wil here ſubjoyn a remarkable paſſage of a learled divine whoſe praiſe is in all the Churches. *Whittaker* (de Eccleſ. contr. 2. cap. 3.) being about to prove that the Church of rome is no true Church of Chriſt. Preſents this for his firſt argument. *Pontifex Romanus non eſt verus Epiſcopus: Ergo Eccleſia Romana non eſt vera Eccleſia. Nam Eccleſia non poteſt eſſe ſine epiſcopo. The Pope of Rome is no true Biſhop: therefore the Church of Rome is no true Church: becauſe the Church cannot be without a Biſhop.* But leaſt this laſt aſſertion cheer up our *Informer* and his fellowes, he addes, *diſputo ex eorum placitis.* That he diſputs upon his popiſh adverſaries principles; and thus claſſeth them among the popiſh party in this point. But how proves he the pope to be no true Biſhop —— *propter præcipuum munus epiſcopi* (ſaith „ he) *quod in illo deſideratur*, „ becauſe of the Chief „office of a Biſhop whcih is wanting in him. And what „is that, *olim epiſcopi Romani diligenter docebant eccleſiam; & nulli facti ſunt epiſcopi niſi qui in hoc munere fideles erant. Olim hoc ad ſe pertinere, & præcipuum ſuum munus eſſe putabant, ut populum ſibi commiſſum docerent atque inſtituerent; adeo ut monſtri ſimile eſſet, per Annos poſt Chriſtum plusquam ſexcentos, epiſcopum aliquem in eccleſia eſſe, qui aut nollet, aut non poſſet populum docere.* „that is, „ of old the Biſhops of Rome diligently „taught the Church, and none were made Biſhopes „who were not faithfull in this office; of old they „lookt upon this as the Chief duety incumbent upon „them to teach and inſtruct the people committed to „them; ſo that fore more then ſix hundred Yeares „after

„ after Chriſt, it would have been lookt upon as a „ monſter, if any ſuch Biſhop were in the Church „ who either was not willing or able to teach the „ people. He addes, *That all the Apoſtolick Biſhopes were ſuch.* And that the Apoſtle requires it in a Biſhop that he be διδακτικός, apt to teach 1 Tim. 3: 2. *hoc eſt* (ſaith he) *non ejuſmodi, qui curet tantum, & det operam, ut alii doceant, & hanc authoritatem docendi aliis tribuat: ſed qui ipſe ſufficiat alios docere.* „ Not ſuch „ a one who is diligent onely to provid, others to „ teach, and gives this authority to others, But who „ is himſelf ſufficient to teach others. This he proves becauſe the Apoſtle is in that place ſhewing, *how the Biſpop moſt be indued and gifted befor he be choſen, and that therfore by* [*being apt to teach*] *we moſt underſtand a perſonal care and ability and not a deputed care, quis enim hoc præſtare non poſſet?* (ſaith he) *who is he who may not perform this.* This he further cleares from 2. tim. 2. 2. where the Apoſtle injoyns Timothy to commit what he had heard of him to faithfull men, *qui eſſent ἱκανοὶ καὶ ἑτέρους διδάξαι*, themſelves able to teach others. Reprehending *Turrian* (and with him our Epiſcopal men) in interpreting that firſt paſſadge of a deputed care as to teaching. And ſhewes that the old interpreter tranſlates διδακτικὸν *a doctor, or teacher.* And *a doctor* (ſaith he) *is ſuch a one as can teach himſelf.* Thereafter he cites *Oecumenius*, and *Chryſoſtom* thus expounding the premiſed ſcripture, and even ſoom of the popiſh ſcoolmen, as *Aquinas* upon this text, who cals this *the proper work and duety of a Prelat.* And ſhewes us that *Aquinas* pertinently applyes to this purpoſe that paſſage, Jer. 3. 15. I wil give Paſtors according to my own heart who ſhal feed yow with knowledge and underſtanding. And that *Cajetan*, and *Catharinus* do thus expound this text. In all which we ſee with how full a conſent of ancient and modern

Churches and divines our non-preaching or seldom preaching Prelates are condemned, and how fully our scripture-argument against them upon this head, is fortified and confirmed.

12. As in other points of difference, so the ancient Bishopes *were as farr from our Prelats fastuus pompe, and sumptuus grandeur which they assume. Ammianus Marcellinus* (*lib. 27. de habitu vitæ beatorum episcoporum*,) tells us of their *tenuitas edendi, potandique parcissime, indumentorum vilitas* &c. *Their spare eating and drinking, their meanenes of apparrel, their lovely countenance, as that which commendes them to God and his true worshippers. Paulus Samosatenus*, his fastuus pompe and attendants, although a great Bishop, is highly condemned, as exposeing our faith to envy and hatred. *Euseb.* (*lib. 7. cap. 29.*) The Canon of the 4 Councell of carthage (insert by *Gratian* in the body of the decree distinct. 41.) provides that, *Episcopus non longe ab ecclesia hospitiolum, vilem supellectilem*, &c. That the Bishop have his little manse not far from the Church that he have meane houshold stuffe &c. *Et dignitatis suæ Authoritatem fide & meritis quærat, and purchase Authority to his office or dignity by faith and good works. Sozom.* (lib, 6. Cap: 16.) Relats of *Basilius Magnus*, Bishop of Cæsaria, that he answered the Imperours præfect who threatned the Confiscation of his goods, thus, *Horum nihil me Cruciari potest, equidem opes non habeo, preterquam lacteram vestem, & Paucos libros. None of these things can torment me, truely I have no goods but a torne garment and some books.* See the *historia motuum* [page 143. to 174.]

Now from all that is said, I think common ingenuity will acknowledge; (and this *Informer* himself, if he be not ane utter stranger to it,) that our present Episcopacy is as far discrepant from that of the ancient Christian Church, as east from west, and by

conse-

consequence that this pleading from the ancient prostasie, or even the after Bishops to legittimat and patronize our present prelacy, is a most gross nonsequitur and notorius fallacy.

---

## Chap. XIV.

*The* Informers *pretended Testimonies out of* Calvine, Beza, Blondel, *&c. For Episcopacy, Examined. Their anti-Episcopall judgment, cleared from their writings. The* Informer *crosses Bishop* Spotswood, *and* Tilen. *His two absurdities which by way of* Dilemma *he offers to us, from our assertion of the unalterables of Presbyterian Government, & our concession of a Proestos early brought in, Scanned, & retorted upon himself. The Authores of* jus divinum Ministerii Evangelici, *vindicated at some length.*

WHereas the *Informer* is bold to affirme that *Calvine, Beza, Blondel*, and other eminent divines who have written against Episcopacy, are reconcilable to it, yea to a hierarchy of the highest stamp. Wee *answer* 1. The full and harmanious consent of Ancient and modern divines and reformed Churches, for that which we plead for in point of Church-Government, shall be exhibit in the last Chapter. 2. As for *Calvin's* judgment in relation to Presbyterian Government, It is so fully known to the world in his writings, that we think there needs no more to put a brand of impudence upon any, then to deny it. And

we doe appeal to his judicious commentes upon all the controverted places of the new Testament betwixt them and us; wherein all that we plead for, either as to the identity of *Bishop* and Presbyter, in *name and thing*, the Presbyteryes power in ordination and jurisdiction, the extraordinary Evangelistick Power of Timothy and Titus, the divine right of the ruling elder, the peoples right in the call of Ministers, the unlawfulnes of Prelats sole power and dominion over their brethren, the unwarrantablenes of Ministers state offices, &c, is clearly asserted. Let any consult him upon Matth. 18. 17. Matth 21: 22. Luk. 22: 25. Act. 6: 2, 3, 4. Act. 14: 23. Act. 20: 17, 28, 29, 30. 1 Cor. 5. 1 Cor. 12. 28. with Rom. 12: 6: 7. 2 Cor. 2: 6, 7. Eph 4: 11, 12. 1 Thess. 5: 12, 13. 2 Thess. 3: 14. Heb. 13: 7, 17. 1 Tim. 1: 3. &c. and 4: 14. 2 Tim 2 4: 2 Tim. 1: 6. Tit. 1: 6, 7. &c. and such like places, where he will be found to give sentence for us against the Prelatik party, and expounding them just as we doe. 3. These adversaries doe grant that the Government in this Church, which famous *Mr. Knox* owned, and all his dayes contended for, was Presbyterial Government. And it is as well knowne and acknowledged by themselves, that he had the sense and judgment both of *Calvin* and *Beza* in that great businesse. *Spotswood* in his history tells us that [John Knox framed our rules of disciplin *in imitation* of what he had *Seen at Geneva.*] *Tilen* in his petulant piece intituled *Paræsis ad Scotos Genevensis disciplinæ Zelotas*, makes this undenyable. He calls Calvin and Beza all along *our Masters*, and alledges that we can hear of nothing but out of their schoole &c. But that they owned Presbyterian Government, as the onely Government appointed in the house of God, he never took the confidence or had the forehead to deny.

deny. When *John Knox* was deſired by ſome to write to *Calvin*, and others about a certain difficulty, he anſwered *that he came not here without all their Judgments in what he had done, and that they might think him unconſtant in writting for a reſolution in that matter.* Now *John Knox* look't upon Epiſcopocy as a limb of Antichriſts Hierarchie, and as haveing *aliquid commumune cum Anti Chriſto.* Something in it common with Antichriſt. So that what the *Informer* mentions of *Meaſſon, and Biſh: Andrews* their aſſerting of *Calvin* and *Beza's* Epiſcopall Government at Geneva, and their preeminence in ordination and juriſdiction, is a groſs calumny. The eminent parts of theſe famous divines might make their judgement have great influence in determining others, but that either *Calvin* or *Beza*, did ever incroach upon the deciſive power of their fellow-Presbyters, or acted any thing *pro imperio* or ſolely, is a calumny which any who ever read their lives can ſufficiently diſprove. Their laboures and practiſe as well as their writings was for mantaineing the due right of Presbyterian Government againſt enemies of all ſortes. In the life of *Galleaceus Caracciolus*, It is reported, Thar Calvin being conſulted by him in a caſe of conſcience requireing ſecrecy (in a great meaſure) would give him no determinat anſwer (tho a ruleing elder in that Church) without conſulting his Brethren. As for that which the *Informer* cites out of Calvines *Inſtit.* [l. 4. c. 4. Sect. 2.] where [He acknowledges that *Jerom* teaches that the proeſtos is ane ancient inſtitution, and that he repeats what *Jerome* ſayes, a *Marco* &c.] Its a pitiful proofe to conclud therupon that Calvin acknowledges dioceſian Prelats as Ancient as *Mark*. For Calvine knew well that *Jerome* ſpeaks but of the proeſtos firſt ſet up, and the *Informer* hath not proved that either *Calvin* or *Jerom* gave their approbation to the ſetting of him up.

And for what he adds [That Calvin sayes *ne ex equalitate ut fieri solet dissidia orirenter*. That they were set up least from equality discord should arise as usuallie there doth,] granting that he acknowledges they were more then meer Moderators, that is fixed Moderators. What then? Are our Prelats no more? Or will his acknowledgment of the *factum*, prove his acknowledment of the *jus*? and though mans corruption abuse parity to discord, what then? our corruption will abuse the best ordinance of God. As for what he cites from *Instit.* (l. 4. c. 5. Sect. 11. Our *Informer* hath not proved, That Calvin by [*Episcopi*] and [*paræciarum rectores*] doth understand *diverse Church officers of Gods appointment*, as he distinguishes the Bishop and Presbyter. That Calvin did not acknowledge the *Episcopus* distinct from the *paræciæ rector* his comment on Tit. 1: 7. makes it evident —— [*For a Bishop &c.*] *locus hic abunde docet nullum esse episcopi & Presbyteri discrimen, quia nunc secundo nomine promiscue appellat quos prius vocavit Presbyteros. Imo idem prosequens argumentum utrumque nomen indifferenter eodem sensu usurpat, quemadmodum & Hieronimus tum hoc loco, tum in Epistola ad Evagrium annotavit. Atque hinc perspicere licet quanto plus delatum hominum placitis fuerit, quam decebat, qui abrogato Spiritus Sancti Sermone, usus hominum arbitrio inductus, prævaluit.* That is, *This place abundantly shewes that there is no difference betuixt a Bishop and Presbyter becaus now again he promiscuusly calls them by the seecond mane, whom befor he called Presbyters, nay prosecuting the same argument he maks use of both the names indifferently in the same sense, as also Ierom both in this place and in his Epistle to Evagrius, hath observed. And hence we may perceive how much hath been ascribed to mens pleasure, & inventiones more then did become, becaus ane use brought in at mens pleasure hath prevaled while the language of the holy ghost is laid aside* —— and after he hath spoken of the first Moderators earlie brought in, he adds — *verum nomen officij* (N. B.) *quod Deus in communi omnibus*

*nibus dederat, in unum solum transferri, reliquis spoliatis & injurium est & absurdum, deinde sic prevertere Spiritus sancti linguam, ut nobis eædem voces, aliud quam voluerit significent, nimis profanæ audaciæ est.* That is, But *that the name of the office which God gave in common to all should be transferred to one only, robbing the rest thereof, is injurious and absurd. More over to pervert thus the language of the holy ghost, that the same words should signifie another thing then he pleased is too profane boldnes.* Thus Calvin puts this censure upon our *Informer*, in making the name [*Bishop*] signifie any more then [*a Presbyter.*] And upon Act. 20. 28. *De voce Episcopi hic notandum, omnes Ephesinos Presbyteros sic vocari indifferenter, unde colligimus Secundum Scripturæ usum nihil a Presbyteris differre Episcopos.* That is, *Concerning the name of Bishop, we must observe this, that all the Presbyters in Ephesus are so called indifferently, hence we conclud that according to the scripture language, Bishops doe nothing differ from Presbyters.* Now let any judge if Calvine make not the *Name and thing* of the scripture Bishop proper to every Minister of a parish, and if he judged a Diocesian Bishop, thus differenced from the parish Minister, to be a warrantable office which he holds to be so crosse to Scripture. So that in the passage which this man hath above cited, he would have all Bishops contending for and reteaning the true scripture function, for none else he can call *eximium munus*, or ane excellent gift. So that those of these places will help our *Informer*. The Context and tenour of that 4 chapter obliedgeth as to think, that this is really the meaning, that whatever titles these Ancients used, yet they designed not thereby to wrong that Presbyteriall Government grounded upon Scripture, which, *Calvin*, is there defending.

And moreover, even straining that place [Chap. 5. par. 11.] to the out most advantage, it will *Inferr* nothing but this, that Bishops, and Parishpriests in those

dayes, had the eſſence of the Paſtorall office; which is not denyed, or that their Paſtorall acts, when rightly performed were valid. The Paſtorall office *Calvin* cals *pium & eximium munus* as the enſuing words doe convince.

As for his citation from Sect: 13. it were very abſurd to think that Calvine by [the heirarchy which the Fathers commend as handed down from the Apoſtles] ſhould underſtand the prelatick hierarchy which this man pleads for. Since 1. Many Fathers, as *Ierome*, never ſaw ſuch a hierarchy ſet up, but by [Biſhops] underſtand either the ωεισβυ at firſt ſet up, or the Biſhops of whom we now heard, who governed with Presbyters joyntly, and had no ſole power in ordination and juriſdiction. 2. *Calvin* ſpeaks of the Fathers commending a Hierarchy, not like the papall, but he tells not what his judgement of that hierarchie is. 3. How could Calvin commend a hierarchie (ſuch as the *Informer* pleads for) or ſo much as acknowledge it as handed doun from the Apoſtles, who ſhews from their Doctrine that they owned no Biſhop higher then a Presbyter, as is clear from what is ſaid. To which we may add Calvins words on Philip: 1. *Epiſcopi nomen omnibus miniſtris eſt commune. Sunt igitur ſynonyma Epiſcopus & Paſtor. Poſtea invaluit uſus ut quem ſuo collegio præficiebant in Singulis Eccleſijs, Presbyteri, Epiſcopus vocaretur Solus. Id tamen ex hominum conſuetudine natum eſt, ſcripturæ authoritate minime nititur.*

„ That is, the name of Biſhop is common to all Mi„ niſters, Biſhop and Presbyter then are one and the „ ſame. —— Afterward the Cuſtome prevailed to „ call the Miniſter whom the Presbyters ſet over their „ meeting, in evry church the Biſhops only, but this had „ its riſe from mens Cuſtome, but is not at all grounded „ on the Authority of Scripture. —— And after he hath ſpoken of the advantage of one to preſide for orders

ders ſake, he adds this limitation ——— *de Singulis corporibus loquor, non de totis provincijs &c: I ſpeak of ſingle incorperations, not of whole provinces*, adding, *preſtaret ſpiritum Sanctum linguarum autorem in loquendo ſequi, quam formas loquendi ab ipſo poſitas in deterius mutare, nam ex corrupta verbi Significatione hoc mali ſecutum eſt, quod per inde ac ſi non eſſent omnes Presbyteri collegæ (N.B.) adeandem vocati functionem, unus, ſibi pretextu novæ appellationis, dominium in alios arripuit.* That is, it were „ better in our ſpeech to follow the holy ghoſt the „ author of languages, then to change into the worſe „ the forms of ſpeaking ſet downe by him. For from „ this abuſed ſignification of the word, this evill „ hath followed, that as if [all Presbyters] were not „ Colleagues called to [the ſame function,] one hath u„ſurped to himſelf a dominion over the reſt under pre„ text of this new appellation.

As for what he objects [p. 78.] from Calvin upon Tit. 1. 5. [ That *unus authoritate præeſt* &c: ] *I Anſr.* After he hath ſaid that every city had ſeverall Presbyters ——— and aſſerted that there are Two ſorts of elders, and that theſe elders were the Biſhops appointed to teach ——— He moves ane objection ——— Had Titus this Princely power and alone, and anſwers ——— *Non permitti arbitrio tiii ut unus poſſit omnia, & quos voluerit Epiſcopos Eccleſijs imponat, ſed tantum jubet ut electionibus præſit tanquam* „ *Moderator.* That is, It is not permitted to Titus „ pleaſure to doe all things alone, and impoſe upon „ the Churches what Biſhops he pleaſed: but he only „ bides him overſee the Elections as Moderator. Paralleling this with Act. 14. 23. where he ſaith that Paul and Barnabas acted not *ſoli, & pro imperio*, that is, ſolely and imperiouſly to put Paſtores upon the people who were not *expetiti or electi*, deſired and choſen, but only *probatos & cognitos*, men approved and knowne

known. Now let this man say himself, doth not Calvin here clearely assert our principles, and kill the diocesian Prelat with the sole power of ordination and jurisdiction?

So that nothing can be hence Inferred, but that Church consistories were not then without order, and that one did præside among them; for *Calvine* sayeth on the 7. verse, *porro locus hic abunde docet nullum esse Presbyteri & Episcopi discrimen.* And he who præsided here was *Titus*, whose Episcopacy we have abundantly disproved.

As for that which he tells us *Calvin* adds, [that one was in authority over the rest at that time,] *ergo*, what? Had not Paul, Barnabas, & Titus ane extraordinary authority & commission? for he sayes, *tunc*, or *at that time* wherein these offices did exist; but will any think that Calvin could mean, a Diocesian Prelats ordinary power which, immediatly befor he was disputing against from the text? He adds presently *nihil tamen hoc ad prophanum & tirannicum collationum morem.* This hath nothing to doe with the profane and tyrranicall Custome of Collations, *longe enim diversa fuit Apostolorum ratio*, for the Apostles case and ground was far different from this. As for that which he addes [of Calvins letters to a Bishop in the Church of Rome, *anent Episcopacy it self, as being of God*] I can appeall this mans conscience, if Calvin thought the Episcopall hierarchie with sole power of ordination and jurisdiction, far less the popish hierarchy, to be of God, and whither he doth not in his Commentaries Particularlie in the places cited, *speak against the diocesian Prelat as such.* Besides, we shall here tell the *Informer* that this passage which he cites as in the volume of his [*opuscula page* 72] upon a search of two several editions, hath not been found. As for his letter to the *King of Pole*, approveing all the degrees of

of the hierarchie] it is ſo groſly contrary to *Calvins* principles and writings, that the *Informer* muſt excuſe us, not to take it upon truſt from him, Eſpecially ſince he exhibits no part of that letter. For his letter to the *Duke* of *Somerſet* (citted by *Durel*, and the more to be ſuſpected as coming from the hands of ſuch ane enemy to his principles,) [*anent ſome fantaſtick ones ſtudiing to bring in confuſion under the name of the goſpell*] we think it a fantaſtick inferenc of our *Informer*, to conclude therupon, that he calls the aſſerters of Presbyterian governement ſuch.

Although in that Epiſtle there is no expreſs *advice to remove Epiſcopacy*, what then? there is no expreſs advice for removing ſeverall other Corruptions. But the Conſequence that therefore *Calvine* did not diſowne theſe Corruptions, the *Informer* himſelf will grant to be a groſs *non ſequitur*. And ſome Conſiderationes of prudence might move to wave the expreſs touching upon this head at that ſeaſon, when light was but dawning as to a Doctrinall reformation, and the ſcales of the groſs cimmerian darkneſs of popery, were but begining to fall off from the eyes of that people. Yet when the *Informer* ſhall peruſe that Epiſtle again, he will find that *Calvine* Leaves it not altogether untouched, when heuſeth theſe wordes, *habeat ſane hoc locum In rebus iſtius vitæ ——— atqui alia prorſus eſt ratio regiminis Eccleſiæ quod ſpirituale eſt, in quo nihil non ad Dei verbum exigi fas eſt, non eſt inquam penes ullum mortalem quicquam hic aliis dare, aut in illorum gratiam deflectere, ——— that is, let this truely have place in affaires of this life ——— but the Church Government, which is ſpirituall, is of a far other nature, wherin there is nothing but what moſt be brought unto the touchſtone of the word of God, here I ſay it is not in the power of any mortall to gratifie any thing unto others, or to decline for their favour.* A paſſage which compared to *Cal-*

*vins*

*vi is* principles in point of Church Government, doth fully Antidot the *Informers* waspish extraction from this Epistle.

For his treatise to the Emperor *Charles the 5i. anent imbracing of a hierarchy tyed by a brotherly society among Bishops and by the bond of truth, and united only to Christ*] I see nothing discrepant in it to Calvines, or Presbyterian principles, If [*Hierarchie*] be rightly taken, and for this (if their be indeed such a passage whereof I have no certainty) I think we can in no reason suppose Calvine to owne the popish Government, even as abstracted from false doctrine, since he holds the very *Diocesian Bishop*, to be contrary to the Apostolick Government, far more the Hierarchy; will any man say, that Calvin did owne all the Locusts of the profane popish orders which are parts of this Hierachy? so that Calvin by *hierarchy, and spirituale regimen*, doth indigitat the most simple and primitive Episcopacy which the fathers speake of; and withall since the embracing of *the gospell simplicity and truth* which Calvin there desires (as he sayes,) would quickly sned off all *Luxuriant* branches of *humane invention* in point of Government, and likewayes since *Calvin* owns the Church Government set down in Scripture *as our pattern* (which doth as much reprobat the popish hierarchy, as the doctrine therein set down, doth their errors;) all this will preponderat towards *Calvins* meaning only a gospell Ministery, which is equally distinct from Bishops in the popish and prelaticall mould. As for the difference [*betwixt the primitive and popish Episcopacy*] I think there is indeed a great difference, & we have proved our present hierarchy to be as much different from it, and soomwhat more if its erastian mould be taken in as the *Informer* must.

The treatise to Charles the fifth, entituled *de necessitate reformanda Ecclesiæ* is so Generally cited by the

the *informer*, without quoting, either page or ſection that himſelf ſeemes half convinced of the Impertinency therof.

For *Saravia* his aſſerting, that he defended *Calvins* opinion againſt *Beza*, he ſaid in this as in the reſt, more then he could prove. For what he adds of *Hooker* and *Durel* who aſſert [*That Presbytery was ſettled at Geneva, becauſe another Biſhop could not be gotten after the popiſh was away, and that it was ſettled not out of a diſlike to the hierarchie, but becauſe they were in ane equality and ſtood ſo, being bent on reforming the doctrine*] I *Anſwer*. His Authores in this aſſertion ſtand upon a very ſlippery and ſandie fundation. What? Were there no able men to be Biſhop after the popiſh Biſhop was gone? and had they not leaſure ſufficient to doe this after the doctrine was reformed? Why lived they ſo long without a beloved hierarchy? and (which is yet more ſtrange) why Imployed they their pens and their paines ſo much for Presbyterian government, and not rather for the hierarchy? why were both *Calvin* and *Beza* ſo active in that which *Iohn Knox* did here in oppoſition to prelacy? But ſtay, hath not the *Informer* told us, that *Maſone* and *Biſhop Andrews* doe aſſert [*That Calvin and Beza aſsumed ane Epiſcopall power at Geneva*] How comes *Durel* and *Hooker* then [*To ſuppoſe a compleat parity among the Miniſters to have begun and continued at Geneva for want of a* Biſhop foreſooth] He muſt grant that ſome of theſe accuſers are ingrained liars and accuſers of the brethren in this point, So he muſt deliberat whither he will beſtow this upon *Maſon and Biſhop Andrews*, or *Hooker* and *Durel*. For what he adds of theſe, that have written for Presbyterian government, *that they deſigned only to prove it lawfull*, it is a groſs Calumny, their deſigne is to prove it *a divine frame of governmcnt appointed in the new Teſtament*, which I hope he will ſay *is neceſſary* as well as *lawfull*, ſince

ſince Chriſt promiſes to the end his preſence with thoſe officers cloathed with his commiſſion. And him ſelf holds that the *end* of that Government practiſed in the new Teſtament, and its grounds are *Moral and perpetual*. For *Blondel* his calling *Epiſcopal preeminence an apoſtolical conſtitution*, which the *Informer* cites page 84. no ſuch wordes being in the *printed copy*, (as he acknowledges) who will be ſo fooliſhly credulous as to take it upon the *Informer* or *Durells* bare word that it was in the *written on*. Unleſs we will admitt the *Informer* (as the Papiſts doe by the Scriptures in their unwritten traditions) to add his unprinted patchments to any author, and thus to diſpute *pro libitu*, and make his weapons from teſtimonies of authors, (as once a certain Chiftain's ſword is ſaid to have done) to wound and kill a great way before the point. He diſtinguiſhes the Government he pleads for, as *divinitus inſtitutus*, or of *divine appointment*, from any other frame as *humane only*, which will ſay that this divine inſtitution muſt ſtand, and all other frames of Government give place to it. The ſame may be accomodat to that which he cites out of Beza (pag 85.) who looked upon the very *Epiſcopus humanus* as he calls him, or the firſt proeſtos, as the firſt riſe of all the popiſh Hierarchie and miſcheiffs.

That ſentence of *Beza* de min. grad. Cap. 21. pag. 343. ſtands intirely thus, *imo C nctos ſic* [id eſt Archiepiſcopos & Epiſcopos] hodie *appellatos, modo ſanctiſſimorum illorum Epiſcoporum* [meaning *Timothy* and *Titus*, &c, whom *Saravia* termed. Biſhops; Beza allowing the deſignation in a ſound & ſcripture ſence] *exemplum imitentur & tam miſere deformatam domum Dei ad amuſſim ex verbi divini regula pro viribus inſtaurent ut Eccleſiæ Chriſtianæ fidos paſtores, cur non agnoſcamus, obſervemus & omni reverentia proſequamur? Nedum ut quod falſiſſime & impudentiſſime nonnulli nobis objiciunt*

tui-

*euiquam uſpiam Eccleſiæ, &c.* certainely there walking up to ſuch rules and patterns as are here preſcribed, as the proviſo's upon which *Beza* Proefeſſes to reverence and owne them, would ſo ſned off the Epiſcopal heteroclyt excreſcencies of our dioceſian Eraſtian Prelats, and ſmooth them to the Scripture Epiſcopacy, as quite to deſtroy their power and office, pleaded for by this pamphleter.

As his acting, ſo his writing for Presbyterian Government accordingly, was not to preſcribe *his owne*, (which *Beza* diſclaimes,) but *Gods example*. How will the *Informer* prove, that *Beza's* denying his preſcribing of *their example of Church Government at Geneua*, meerly as ſuch, will infer his not commending *a divine frame of Church Government*? This was not to preſcribe *his example* ſimpliciter. And how will he prove that *Beza* looked upon a Government which he held to be [*the egg from which Anti Chriſt ſprung*] as *Dei beneficentia*, or Gods *beneficence*, He makes him a very groſs ignoramus, for what man of the meaneſt capacity would ſay ſo? And if *Beza* held the firſt Epiſcopacie or proeſtos to be a receſs from the divine inſtitution, he certainly condemned it [*in ſo far.*] And the dioceſian Prelat he holds to be *Satanicall*. Therefore when he ſeems to condemne *the deſowning of all order of Bishops*, he muſt underſtand it of a condemning *ſcripture order*, & the beautiful ſubordination among Church officers, or that divine order that is among them. But here again I muſt needs take notice, that in this paſſage of *Beza* in his diſpute with *Saravia*, the *Informer* hath ſned off that which wounds his cauſe to death, for the words following doe diſcover another ground of this diſtinction of Biſhops from Preſbyters (viz Beza and Jeroms *humane Cuſtome*) then what the *Informer* would perſuade. For it followes immediatly, *neque hoc ſcelere tenentur, qui de epiſcopalis muneris ſive proſtaſias finibus regendis, & de diſcrimine in-*

*ter ordinem & gradum. postulant, ut ex verbo Dei decidatur.* Whence it is evident that he does not understand Bishops set over Presbyters to be *Jure divino* or speaks of them in this place.

As for the passages of *Beza's* letters to Bishop *Whitegift, and Grindal,* which the *Informer* after cites, (pag. 86.) I say 1. That certainly *Beza's* principles so largely expressed from Scripture anent Church Government, and the contrariety of the episcopus humanus or humane Bishop, (far more the Diocesian Satanical Bishop) to the divine rule in his principles, will necessarly infer, that in this great mans Judgement none of these Prelats had *qua tales* or *as such*, a lawfull spirituall authority from God, 2. It is as certaine that all *Beza's* pleading and arguments strikes against the diocesian Prelat or Arch prelat as in that capacity, and against *this office and policy in it self*, abstracting from its union unto the pope, so that he could own no authority that way committed to them of God. 3. It followes, that since he judged the episcopall hierarchy unlawfull, he held the *first parity unalterable*, since he pleades for it upon morall perpetuall Scripture grounds and institutions. And by these his solid Scripture grounds, when ex professo handling this point and theologically, we are more to determine of his Judgement then by *Missives.* Wherein the circumstances of time, and severall exigences, might engadge to some insinuations in point of a civill deference, and respect. But however that be, we are to look unto *intentio and natura operis* in his writings, or the *native designe thereof*, rather then critically to scanne or straine every *practical conformity or disconformity* therunto. And the *Informers* answer to what we offer anent *the assertions of Bishop Mortoune, Bilson, Jewel, who write for the parity of Bishop and Presbyters by di-*

vine

*vine right* viz, [*That they held the* Epiſcopall *office themſelves*] charging them thus with *a practical breach of their principles*, moſt make him retract this argument, as ſignifiing any thing againſt us, Since the retortion thereof is ſo manifeſt; and therefore nothing he hath ſaid will impeach *Calvine and Beza's* impugning of Epiſcopacy, whoſe impugnations of it will ſtand to all generations.

Moreover in this citation of that *epiſt.* to *Bishop Grindal*, the *Informer* hath ſned off the half of the ſentence viz, *quod tu igitur coram iſtam quorundam ἀνθαδίαν, tamdiu pertuliſti reverende vir, in eo ſane inſigne patientiæ ac lenitatis Chriſtianæ ſpecimen dediſti, quo majori &c.* —and neer the cloſe of the ſame letter *Beza* faithfully adviſeth, as the fitteſt remedy for removing offences, *ut in legitimo — cætu, ex uno Dei verbo, abolitis ſemel papiſticæ tyrannidis veſtigiis, ea conſtituatur adminiſtrandæ Eccleſiæ ratio, non quæ huic vel illi adlubeſcat, non quæ veteri aut recenti conſuetudine (———) ſed quæ ——— firmo verbi Dei fundamento ſuperſtructa piorum Conſcientiis fatiſſaciat, & in eternum perſeveret*; that is, *that in a lawfull Aſſembly from the Word of God onely, all the footſteps of popiſh Tyranny being once abolished, that Method of Church Government be eſtabliſhed, not which ſhall pleaſe this or that perſon, not which is founded upon new or old Cuſtom or the wisdom of the flesh, but which being buile upon the ſure foundation of the word of God, may ſatiſſie the conſciences of the godly, and endure for ever.* Which rule and mould of Biſhops would no doubt caſhier and raze to the foundation the dioceſian Eraſtian prelate whom he pleades for, yea all the Prelates in Brittain.

For what he adds (p. 87.) It may be eaſily, and without prejudice to our cauſe granted, that *God by his providence had made him a Judge.* The *Informer* will not owne ſuch ane Atheiſticall principle, as to deny that the Biſhops civil government in England, or pretended Eccleſiaſtick, is not the object of divine providence,

or be so brutish as to conclude Gods approbation of usurping Tyrannes, from his permissive providence in reference to their tyranny or usurpation, else he will for ever destroy his loyalty and fealty, either to the *King* or his *Lordbishop*.

That passage of *Calvins* letter to *Cardinal Sadolet*, after citedby him (p. 88.) though admitted, is a poor proof *that he held Church Government to be alterable*. Certainly Calvin held the scripture-parity to be the most ancient Government *Vetustissimæ Ecclesiæ*, for of the most ancient Church, for such no doubt he held the *Apostolick Church* to be.

Beside, wee must tell him that this passage upon search is not found, and as it is here expressed is very insignificant; since by *Vetus Ecclesia*, he may understand the Church after the Apostles time, which early began to Corrupt the Government.

As for *Salmasius his retracting his opinion as to Church Government*, it will no more impeach the truth it self which he asserts, then any other mans defection will weaken the sound Doctrine which he once held. Would the *Informer* take this argument from the Papists if they should plead from the retractiones of protestants, and from their writing for popery, that *the protestant Doctrine were not sound*? would he not say that their first practise, or writings for truth, will stand good and witnesse against them in their defection? Though it may be a question whither that retraction be reall or not which *Durel* mentions, and the *Informer* out of him. (p. 89.) Especially this being another of our *Informers* mute citations which he keeps (as he doth the state of the questions in these Dialogues) under the Clouds, pointing us to no page in that Answer of *Salmasius to Milton*. We will not here stand to shew how that *Salmasius* eyes were blinded with *Court-gifts* and pensions, having receaved

ved no small summe from King Charles the second for his encouragement to that worke, and several learned divines who best knew him, think his literature more Considerable then his divinity was solid.

As for that place of *Salmasius* in his *Walo. Mess.* (c. 4. p. 253.) cited page 90. the Intire sentence is *Epistolæ illæ* viz ; ( quæ Ignatii dicuntur ) *natæ & suppositæ videntur circa initium aut medium secundi sæculi, quo tempore primus singularis Episcopatus supra Presbyteratum Introductus fuit.* Whatever time this was, it appears by what followes that place in *Salmasius*, that about this time Chnrch power began exceedingly to be Corrupted, and Bishops exalted almost to ane equality with Christ; and men began to plead a *jus divinum* for them; for *Ignatius*, (*In Epistola ad Trallenses*) *asserts*, *Episcopum venerandum esse sicut Christum quemadmodum Apostoli præceperunt, that the Bishops must be had in veneration as Christ, as the Apostles have commanded*, and he cites the Apostles words, but such as do no where occurr in our Bibles.

And certanly if there be no more truth in that relation anent his retraction, mentioned by that author, then their is soliditie in that ground of it which he alledges, it is not worth the noticing. For *the confusions in England* cannot with any shew of Reason be charged upon Presbyteriall Government, which was never yet settled there. And this *Informer* dare not deny the blest effects of truth and unitv & godlines, which it hath had in this land, as is acknowledged by Churches abroad, and particularly in that passage of the *Syntagma confessionum* which he cites in the last dialogue, If *Blondel* in calling Episcopacy *most ancient*, doth except *the more ancient Apostolick times*, which he pleads as exemplifying *Presbyterian parity*, he gives it but the spurious after-birth of *humane antiquity*. The same we say as to his passage cited out of *Moulin*

(p. 90.) and if something of the [humane proestos] were granted to have creeped in ere Iohn went off the stage, will that commend it any more then *that mistery of Iniquity, and love of preeminence* which the Scripture assures us was in Paules time and his? Surely by no meanes.

Besides, we must here again tell our *Informer* that this *Citation* out of *Moulen* is among the rest of his *Mutes*, since he hath neither noted booke nor page.

But now from our opinion of the unalterablenes of Presbyterian government, and our acknowledgment of the bringing in of a Proestos so early, the *Informer will involve us* (he sayes) *in one of Two great absurdities. Parturiunt montes!* What are these? the 1. is [*That that generation who lived shortly after Iohn, was altogether ignorant of Christ and his Apostles minde anent Presbyterian parity, else they would not have adventured to change the government*] But this absurdity is easily discussed, for it lights equally upon the Instance already given of Israells defection in worshipping the golden Calf fourtie dayes (sooner then 40. years or more) after the holy patterne of doctrine shewed them upon the mount. How often doe we find suddener changes in scripture of the divine Institutions? How quickly after Ioshua and the elders did all Israell depart from Gods way and ordinances? How quickly did they relapse after deliverances, both in the times of the Kings and of the judges, yea and after solemne vowes of Reformation? How quickly after Hezekias death did they turne aside? How quickly after Iosiahs death? How quickly after Solomons death did Rehoboam forsake the law of God and all Israell with him? I think these scripture instances of as universal, & far greater defections then this was anent the proestos, might have made this man ashamed to bring this as ane absurditie. Now what will he say to his own Question here? Is

it possible

it poſſible, is it probable that Gods Iſraell could be ignorant of his minde, and adventure ſo quickly to change his ordinances? Heard not all the Churche of Iſrael Gods voice from mount *Sinai*? Had not theſe departers afterward known or ſeen his eminent ſeers, heard his word and ſeen his works? Could they be altogether ignorant of his minde who thus ſuddenly departed from him? How could they then adventure to make ſuch a change? Alace! What a poor *queriſt* is this? I think indeed He and his party have given the Inſtance in our generation, that ſuch a ſudden defectione is both poſſible and probable. Was ever a nation more ſolemnlie and univerſallie ingaged unto God, and had ſeen more of his greatnes, power, and glorie, then wee did in the late worke of reformation? How long is it ſince Scotland not onely knew and imbraced Presbyterian Government; but alſo ſolemnlie vowed to mantaine it? But he knowes how univerſally this work and cauſe of God is now rejected, his Covenant abjured and diſowned. And the *Informer* himſelf (who for what I know, might have ſeen our firſt beautifull houſe) is pleading for this *perjurius* change of Gods ordinances and lawes, and breaking his everlaſting Covenant. Read he never the 106. Pſal. 7. vers. *They provocked him at the ſea even the red ſea, and vers* 11. *The waters covered their enemies and there was not one of them left* —— *Then believed they his words, they ſang his praiſe, they ſoon frogat his works, they waited not fr his counſell.* The *Informer* bluntly ſuppoſes ane impoſſibility of a peoples croſſing light in apoſtazing changes, and that all that generation moſt needs give a formall conſent to this change of government in order to its introduction; both which are groundleſs ſuppoſitions, and they render this horne of his *Dilemma* very pointleſſe. Beſides, this change (as we ſaid before) was but ſmall

at the first, onelie a *fixed Moderater*, and far from his Prelacy, which even in *Jeroms* time was but come the length of taking from Presbyters ordination, or rather the rituall part of it. And the change had plausible pretexts of order, and union, as every innovation hath its own pretences, besides that this change was not all at once but by degrees. Wee must also here tell him, that the same very suggestion is his 3d. Reason to prove *Jeroms* bringing in Bishops in the Apostles time, and so a nauseating repitition.

But if we decline this absurdity, the next he thinks is worse viz, *That that generation went over the belly of light in changing the Government, and conspired against Christ and his Apostles Government, and none are found testifying against it.* *Answer* 1. This absurdity doth likewayes fall upon the former Scripture instances of greater, and more sudden, and as universal defections of the Church of Israel. What will he say to these questions in relation thereunto? Were all ignorant? Did all sin against light, and adventure presumptuously to change the divine ordinances? And as for a Testimony against these evills, the *Informer* himself and his party (for all their clamoures against us) falls under ane obligation to answer this, in relation to many corruptions and erroures, which as early creept into the Church as Prelacy; Wherof we gave Instances already, and no Testimonies are recorded against them. He seems to have forgot, or to be ignorant of our divines answer to this argument of Papists, calling for our producing of Testimonies against such and such evills, or dating their first rise, viz. *That there might be, tho we have not known them, and that it is bad arguing from the defect of the History, or the darknes of the first original of such a corruption, to deny the plaine mater of fact, and the corruption it self to be such.* How many Thousand eminent persons and acts of these times (which we told him,

the

the learned doe acknowledge, to be very dark as to matter of fact) have never come to our knowledge? And since we have often told him from *Jerom* that this change was lent, and by considerable degrees, and intervalles of time, and Method of its procedor, some might be overtaken with weaknes, others puffed up with ambition, and upon this ground the one might endeavour, & the other give way to this change, especially its first degrees being small in respect of what followed. Knowes not this man, *that the evill one sowes his tares while men sleep?* And this hierarchie being as in its nature, so in its rise, *a Mystery*; Mystery of Iniquity! Mystery Babylon! Yea *and a Mystery which was working long before this change*, even in Pauls time; upon all these grounds his absurdity evanishes, and reflects a greater absurdity upon himself, who would have us shut our eyes against Scripture light upon such pretences as these, & rather embrace a corruption contrary unto it, then acknowledge that the Church did erre. We know very well what a wicket this notion hath opened for obtruding and retaining popish innovations, and these men are fast warping in to that Method. As for that which he adds of *Blondel* (*p.* 94) *who asserts that the Presbyters made him proestos, or fixed Moderator, who was first ordained.* Wee told him already that this fixed president, tho a deviation from the Scripture rule, yet is farre from *the diocesian Prelats sole power in ordination and Jurisdiction*, So that his confidence (some will be apt to say impudence) is strange in calling this *a power episcopall now existent*, since notwithstanding all its after growth, it was not in *Jeromes* time come the length of our present Hierachical power of Prelats, by many dayes journey. Neither is it probable that Blondel could suppose this to be allowed of John, which he holds to be crosse to the divine pattern.

As for *Blond* (Apol: pag: 25.) the *Informer* hath been miſtaken in this citation, no ſuch words being found in that place. But in page 52. after that he hath abundantly proven *this (theſis) initio Presbyter & Epiſcopus ſynonyma fuerunt*, [that in the beginning Biſhop and Presbyter were one and the ſame.] he begins the next ſect. thus. *Ubicumque Primum naſcente Chriſtianiſmo Presbyterorum aggregari Collegium cæpit, Antiquiſſimum* (rectius Antiquiſſimo) *inter Collegas Primatus Contigit ut conceſſus totius Caput, fratrumque tandem πρωτεύς jure quodam πρωτοτοκίας fieret.* Which onely amounts to thus much, that firſt a moderator, among miniſters being eſtabliſhed, grew by peecmeal to a fixed proſtaſie and after he hath Confirmed this, he addes in the next ſect: *Cum itaque Collegium id eſt ordinatus ratione utentium cætus ſine ordine nec inſtitui, nec Conſervari, nec agere, nec agi, (amplius dicam) nec cogitari poteſt; æquabilis inter ejuſdem muneris Conſortes, ac ſeſe honore mutuo prævenientes ſanctos paritas, divina propemodum ὁμοψυχία & commune Conſilium, in συγχύσιν aut ἀναρχίαν nequaquam degenerabant: ſtabant enim æquo (in eodem gradu & ordine) jure omnes ſed ſuo quiſque loco; erantque in familiâ quâque Eccleſiaſticâ, poſt primo genitum ſecundo, tertio &c. Geniti, qui majorem natu fratrem (ſecundum Patrem cæleſtem) colebant, eique nec ambienti nec poſcenti (invidioſo nunc) πρωτοκαθεδρίας καὶ πρωτασίας. In ſingulis communis regiminis actibus jure volentes cedebant, ac primas ubique partes deferebant; ut ſi quando novus Cooptandus eſſet Collega, Cleri totius jam conſiſtentis plebiſque Conſentientibus ſuffragiis & judicio Comprobatis, (N.B.) totius Presbyterii χειροθεσία (præunte tamen ac reliquorum nomine ſolemnia benedictionum verba pronunciante promotione antiquiſſimo) in poſſeſſionem muneris mitteretur, priorum per Conſecrationem quoddamodo filius factus, qui λειτουργίας, καὶ ἱερωσύνης ratione æquo cum aliis omnibus jure (licet ἀξιωγνησίας) frater erat, ubi vero quæſtionis in Eccleſiæ re-*

*regimine quicquam emergeret, consultantium in commune fratrum disceptationibus (quasi naturæ jure favore omnium firmato,) præesset* Senior; *non gradu alio major* (N.B.) *non nativa gradus communis potestate potior, sed adventitiâ ob ætatis meritum delegata, superior.*

Which is this in summ [that though the colledg of the „ ordained were all alike as to their official power, yet „ least their joynt councel should fall under anarchical „ confusion, the first ordained minister (althogh of the „ same degree [& juridical power with his colleagues) „ had a sort of veneration and precendency as to some „ acts, but stille in their name, & by their consent who „ were his brethren. Which will reach a patrociny to the diocesian Erastian Prelat, with his sole power of ordination and jurisdiction, his negative voice in Church judicatories, and his delegation of Ecclesiastick power to the whole synod, his civil state, office &c. When east and west shal meet together. Then he addes.

*Hanc originalem Ecclesiasticæ politiæ formam sub Apostolorum oculis natam, non immerito putavit* Hilarius, *quid enim pietati, naturæ rationibusque dictamini consonum magis, quam ut priorum canitiem reverenter habeant ætate posteriores? fac tamen Apostolis non modo non improbantibus, sed palam laudantibus ortam; ego sane libere ab initio observatam Christianisque sive ab Apostolis sive ab eorum discipulis traditam, sed ut mutabilem & pro usu & arbitrio Ecclesiæ mutandam (prout in causa consimili piæ memoriæ Crakanthorpus sensit) crediderim.* In which passage he pleades onely for this fixed moderatour, and doth not positivly assert the Apostolik institution for it, but comes neer *Bezaes* expressiones in reference to the [Episcopus humanus]

As for *Blondels* confessing this *primus Presbyter* to have had authority with his precedency, as the *Informer* is bold to assert, he had done well to point us to the place where these wordes are found [*quis enim præsidens*

*dentiamſine authoritate ſomniet?*] for upon ſearch they are not found; but it ſeems the *Informer* puts this ſenſe upon his words which follow theſe cited above· *ac forte conſiſtorialium omnium qui Paſtorum Eccleſias quaſque in commune regentium ἐπισκοπὴν urgent, calculos evertit, quod ab ipſa Apoſtolorum ætate collegii cujuſque Preſbyterialis ſingulare quoddam caput fuit. Qui vero? an noſtrum ullus ſynedrium ſibi (N. B.) vel ἀκέφαλον vel πολυκέφαλον hactenus ſomniavit? an non eodem inter nos jure modoque, vel per vices, pares inter pares, vel delegata a paribus ad tempus poteſtate præſunt, quo inter chriſtianiſmi primordia ævo honoris inter conſeniores primas fuit?* Where he denyes that this ſingular head of the conſiſtory, or moderator his power did juſtle with, or evert the common votes or Epiſcopacy of the Paſtoures, and conſequently their joynt Presbyterial government, becauſe the conſiſtory or meeting could neither be without a head, (or mouth) nor have many heads, which he aſſimilates to the then power of their moderators, choſen from among his equals and co-presbyters, either by turns, or a delegated power of preſidency for ſome time.

The *Informers* citation of *Chamier* (p. 35.) [*acknowledging from the begining a*[*primus Presbyter*]*with a*[*nova poteſtas and juriſdictio*]*ne eſſet Epiſcopatus mere titulus*:; *Or a firſt Presbyter, with a new power and juriſdiction* &c.] Burns his fingers, and rebounds a deadly blow upon himſelf; for in calling this juriſdiction and power, *Nova* or *new*, he makes it later then the *firſt ſcripture patent* anent that Presbyters Authority, which was the ſame with that of his Brethren before this humane ſupperadded power. And conſequently he muſt look upon him onely as *Beza's humane Biſhop*, ſuppoſing *ane anterior divine Biſhop* which is the Paſtour or Miniſter.

And here again the *Informer* puts us to tell him that this his citation of *Chamier* attributinge a new juriſdiction

ction from the beginning to the *primus Presbyter*, or firſt Miniſter, is ſo general, without pointing at either book or page, that it ſeemes he reſolved that in this (as in other paſſages) none ſhould trace him, to know whither he cited true or falſe. However the place he means is, *lib.* 10. *de oecum. pont. c.* 5. Where *Chamier* grants *primum Presbyterum accepiſſe novam poteſtatem, that the firſt Presbyter receaved a new power.* But that it was ſo *from the beginning*, is our *Informers* incruſted *eekement*, which (as in another paſſage of *Blondell*) we muſt ſuppoſe his lyncian eyes diſcovered in ſome written copy of *Chamier*, which the printer was ſo uncivil as not to put in, becauſe this our great doubt-reſolver was not overſeer at the preſſe. Any who looketh upon that chapter may diſcover that *Chamiers* ſcope is to prove that *ab initio regimen Eccleſiæ fuit Ariſtocraticum, that from the beginning the Church government was Ariſtocracy, and that the diſparity which after came in uſe, was ane innovation.*

As for what he adds of *Moulin*, (pag. 76.) If he hold [*The Epiſcopall power in ordination to be among theſe things, which, though in the Apoſtles time, yet were alterable*] He may be probably ſuppoſed to include it among *the Apoſtiles extraordinary expired prerogatives*, which this man muſt acknowledge will lay no foundation for prelacy. As for *Stillingfleet*, we are not concerned in his principles, or any debat betuixt him & them. For that which he calls ane evaſion [*Anent the alteration of ſome things in the Apoſtolick Church*] As wee diſowne *Stillingfleet*, in making *the frame of government which the Apoſtles eſtabliſhed in the Church, verſatile, various or alterable.* So we diſowne this *Informer in reſolving it ſolely upon the Churches deciſion*, [what Apoſtolick practiſes are imitable or morall, and what not.] A dangerous popiſh principle, and wherein he will be found inconſiſtent with himſelf. But for the apoſtolick government by the

Com-

Common Concell of Presbyters, wee hold it morall and perpetual, upon the same grounds of *the Churches union and edification* which himself doth plead. As for *the shifts and bad issues which he alleadges Presbyterian writters are driven unto*, Neither he nor any of his party can make it appear, but his own pitifull shifts, and of others of his way, in pleading for this Hierarchy, wee hope by this time are sufficiently apparent. As for *Durells* offer [*To get Episcopacy ane approbation from all forraigne divines*] we lett it pass as a peice of prelatick pageantry fitt to fill pamphlets. *Ad pompam non ad pugnam* —— *quid tanto tulit hic promissor hiatu.* *Durel* and the *Informer* cannot stand befor their evidences, who have made the Contrary appear. For what he adds anent our *Superintendents*, *as haveing upon the matter ane Episcopal power*, I referr him to the defence of the Epistle of *Philadelphus* against Spotswoods Calumnies, printed at the end of *Didoclavius page.* 30, 31. Where he will find the difference betuixt them and Prelats cleared and stated in 12. Particulars to his Conviction, unless he hath resolved —— *Ne si persuaseris, persuaderis.* So that worthy *Mr. Knox* gave no patrocinie to prelacy in Countenancing the admission of Superintendents. How he hath deryved his Prelacie *from Scripture, and through antiquitie to reformed times, & Churches, in their confessions*, Let the impartial judge by what I have answered from the beginning. As for the Authors of *jus divinum Minist: Anglic:* [*Their proof of the identitie of Bishop and Presbyter, at length cleared from Fathers, Schoolemen, & reformed divines, even from Episcopall* divines in *England*] the *Informer* had done better not to mention that peice, then to have made such a simple & insipid returne, [*Anent the Scoolmens nottone, whither Episcopacy be a different order from Presbytery, or a different degree of the same order*] for though this were granted that the scoole-men tost such *a question*, dare he

he say that the Ancient Fathers both greek and latine, and late reformed divines cited in that learned peice, *in their clear and positive assertions of the parity of Bishop & Presbyter jure divino*, intertained any such notion as this? Againe, had he been so ingenuus and true to the learned authores of that peice, and unto himself, as he ought to have been, he might have found cited therein a passage of *Cassander* in his book of *Consult.* (*Artic.* 14) Which breaks this his answer all in peices, and because his squeemish eyes lookt asquint upon it, I shall here sett it downe, that it may appear what a great charge this is which he brings against these divines. *An Episcopatus inter ordines ecclesiasticos ponendus sit, inter theologos & canonistas non convenit; convenit autem inter omnes in Apostolorum ætate inter episcopos & presbyteros nullum discrimen fuisse, sed post modum schismatis evitandi causa episcopum Presbyteris fuisse præpositum &c:* That is, *Whither Episcopacy is to be placed among the Ecclesiastick orders, It is not agreed between the Theologues & Canonists, but it is agreed among all, that in the Apostles age there was no difference between Bishops & Presbyters, but afterward upon the ground of eviting Schisme, the Bishop was sett ever Presbyters, &c.* Now whither these disputants did agree *That alwayes from the Apostles time, there were Bishops distinct from Presbyters*, as this Informer is not ashamed to affirme. Let the greatest adversarie judge by this account of such ane impartiall witnes. How could he say, that these Fathers might be of this mind, and likwayes these later divines, that alwayes from the Apostles there were Bishops set over Presbyters. What a selfcontradicting tenet is this for any rationall man to intertaine? viz, *Bishops and Presbyters, re & nomine, in name and thing, the same in the Apostles times, and in their doctrine:* and yet [*that Bishops were set over Presbyters by the Apostles, and distinct from them in their times.*] What will he make of all Jerome's Scripture

Scripture proofes through the Apostles times, and writings, anent this compleat parity of Bishops and Presbyters? of the saying of *Ambrose* [That, *Non per omnia conveniunt scripta Apostolorum ordinationi quæ nunc est in Ecclesia.* The writtings of the Apostles agree „ not in every thing with the ordinance or appoint- „ ment (he means of government) which is now in the „ Church.] What will he make of *Bishop Jewel* telling *Harding*, in his defence against him? [*That in calling it a hæresie to affirme Bishops and Presbyters to be one, He reflects upon Ierome and other Fathers whom he cites against him, yea upon the Apostle Paul, and makes him also a Hæretick*] What will he make of that assertion of *Beza*, *Episcopus papam peperit. The Bishop brought forth the Pope.* Of *Whittaker* [*That the setting up the Prelat, yea the first proestos or president to prevent Schisme, was a remedy worse then the disease.*] Now if he will reconcile these sayings and assertions with their holding Bishops distinct from Presbyters, to have been in, and from the times of the Apostles, he will prove a wonderfull *Oedipus*.

But our *Informer* hath not yet done with these Authors, and hath another reflection upon them anent what they say page 64. [That *Eusebius* and *Iræneus* were deceaved themselves, & deceaved others] he tells us 1. [*They are hard put to it when seeking to relieve themselves by discrediting these authores*] But this man is hard put to it, if he deny that which is so Notourly true, & made good by so many of the learned. Were *Iunius* and *Scalliger* (who are approved herein by *Dr Reynolds*) hard put to it, who demonstrats *Eusebius* gross errors & mistakes. 2. He sayes *Though in some things Eusebius was mistaken, most he be so in every point wherin he maks Bishops superior to Presbyters, & drawes their succession from the Apostles.* *Ans.* For the Catalogues of Bishops from the Apostles, we spoke to it already, and for *Eusebius* speaking alwayes in that straine, the reverend au-

thors

thors of that peece, (with others) doe tell the *Informer* that all that Eusebius sayes, is that *it is reported* — that his learned censurer *Scaliger*, maks it appear that he read ancient histories *parum attente*, (not attentivly,) & that he takes his measures in this point, & his relations upon trust, from *Clemens fabulus*, & *Hegesippus* not extant.

3. The *Informer thinks it strange* [*that they can suppose Irenæus* (*Iohns contemporarie and disciple*) *to be deceaved as to Church government.*] *Answer.* Had he but looked upon the 4. *proposition* of their *appendix*, he might have seen this objection fully removed. For therein they make good from many places of *Irenæus* (which were tedious here to transcribe) that by Bishops he understood meer Presbyters, and not Bishops distinct from Presbyters. From which places of *Irenæus* they collect. 1. That he calls Presbyters Successors of the Apostles. 2. That he calls them Bishops. 3. That he holds the Apostolick doctrine to be derived by their succession. 4. That what in one place he sayes of Bishops, the same he sayes elswhere of Presbyters; which sense and account of him they back with pregnant Testimonies of *Dr. Reynolds*, & *Whittaker*, & other learned protestant divines, and lights in that Church. And in *proposition* 7. anent the pretended Succession of Prelats from the Apostolick times, they cleare it that these Successions are drawen from meer Presbyters, viz, the πρωτοστάτης or the Minister first ordained, as among the *Athenians* their were 9. *Archontes* or *Chief* Rulers, equall in Authority: yet the Succession of Governours in *Athens*, was derived from one of them who was the *first Archon*, *ut compendiosior ac minus impedita esset temporum enumeratio*, that the Calculation of times might not be hindered, but be the more compendious.

4. He sayes *it is more likly that Jerom was deceaved, If we understand him to speak of Bishops who were introduced af-*

*ter the Apostles times, then Eusebius or Irenæus who lived before*] *Ans.* That *Eusebius* was deceaved, is not only alleadged, but proven by the learned, and *Ierom* proving so clearlie from Scripture the identity of Bishop and Presbyter both in name and thing, doth convincinglie inferr that the Bishops set over Presbyters, are discrepant from the scripture pattern. That *Irenaus* by Bishops understood these first Moderators, is made good from his writings.

*Next*, wheras these reverend authores (pag. 114, 115.) say *that Irenæus by Bishops meaned* [*Presbyters*,] *and* (*page.* 65.) *That the Fathers spoke of Church officers of former times after the stile of their owne, and that the Bishops in the Catalogues are onlie the first ordained Presbyters, for the more expedit reckoning*] this man thinks these Answers inconsistent; Because 1. *they say that Eusebius & Irenæus were deceaved when they spoke of Bishops, And Next that by Bishops, Irenæus meaned only Presbyters. Ans.* Had the *Informer* attended better the places he points at, he would have keepd off this fantastick reflection. For they shew that these first *Proestotes* or Moderators, *who were in themselves, and upon the Matter, meere Presbyters*, were by former times and writers presented under ane *Episcopal notion*, and the power of Bishops then prevalent, unto *Eusebius* and *Irenæus*; whom *Eusebius* especially, too credulously following in his *Character* and accounts of them, occasioned the deceaving of others, and that he and *Irenæus* speaking of them in that manner and stile in the Catalogues, might deceave others, by naming them so, who were upon the mater meer Presbyters; whom the succeeding writers following (as they shew out of *Junius*. Contr. 2. Ch: 5. not: 18.) and fancying to themselves such Bishops as then had obtained, fell into these snares of tradition, because they supposed that according to the Custome of their times, there could be but one Bishop in

in a Church at the ſame time. And to cleare it, that the perſons whom *Irenæus* ſpeaks of, were upon the mater, *Presbyters*, in anſwer to that objection from *Irenæus* (lib: 3. Cap: 3.) where *Biſhops are named as ſet up by the Apoſtles*, They anſwer that the word *Biſhop* hath a various acceptation: and that *Irenæus names Anicetus, Higinus, Pius, Presbyters of the Church of Rome*, the words being then promiſcuouſlie uſed. So that whatever impreſſion *Irenæus* might have of them according to the language and Cuſtome of the time, yet upon the matter they were Presbyters only: and therefore they put the Epiſcopall partie to prove *that thoſe whom they named Biſhops, were veri nominis Epiſcopi, or Hierarchicall Biſhops*. They doe not ſpeak ſo much of the Impreſſion which *Irenæus* or *Euſebius* had of them, as of the *true nature and State* of theſe Church-officers, whom according to the Cuſtome of their times they call Biſhops. By *Irenæus* his calling them ſometimes Presbyters, according to the promiſcuous uſe of the names, even handed down to him, they prove that his expreſſing them under ane Epiſcopall notion then receaved, or any ſuch impreſſion of them which he might entertaine, was wrong: ſince according to the ſcripture language the Biſhop and Presbyter imports no other office then a Paſtour. What inconſiſtency will our *Informer* ſhew in this, that *Irenæus* and others were deceaved in repreſenting the firſt *Proeſtotes* under ane Epiſcopall notion, upon a *Credulous* report from their forefathers: and yet that the perſons whom they thus repreſented were upon the mater Presbyters.

As for what he adds (p. 102.) [from *Bucer* (*de animarum cura*) anent a *Proeſtos*, or the Election and ordination of one who went before the reſt, and had the *Epiſcopal Miniſterie* in the Chief degree, even in the times of the Apoſtles, by the Teſtimony of *Tertullian, Cyprian, Irenæus, Euſebius*, ancienter then Ie-

*rom.*] Wee say that any who knowes *Bucers* judgment in Church government, and are acquaint with his writings theranent, will acknowledge that the *Proestos* is the utmost length he goes as to Episcopacy; and a *Proestos* during life, hath no doubt something of ane *Episcopal Ministerie*, and is above his Brethren: and we are to expone his *summus gradus*, or Chief degree, by the word *præcipue* or *Chiefly*, that goes before. Who will doubt but the constant fixed *Proestos* is in so farr set over the rest? But here we must minde the *Informer* of Two things. 1. That this *Proestos* chosen by the Presbytery, is (as we said) farr short of the Diocesian *Prelat* who owns no Presbyters in his election, & hath ane arbitrary power over them. 2. That it being thus *de facto*, is farr from amounting to a proof of *the jus*, and who will say that *Bucer* could take the Apostle James to be formalie *Bishop of Ierusalem*, or chosen to be *a fixed Moderator by Presbyters*, whose Apostolick office both *Bucer* and the *Informer* will acknowledge to have *reached the whole world*, in relation to the watering & planting of Churches. Next, if these words will plead for a Hierarchie, even in the Apostles times, and that Bucer took upon the Testimonie of *Tertullian*, *Irenæus* &c, the Apostle James and others for Hierarchicall Bishops, surely he was oblidged to have taken notice of *Ieroms* proofs for the parity of Bishops & Presbyters in the Apostles times, which since he doth not, its most probable that he means to assert the *factum* only, of exalting Presbyters to such a degree at that time, but not the *jus* as is said: else I see no consistencie in the words if he reckon the Apostle James in this account. For he sayes *Apostolorum temporibus unus ex Presbyteris electus. That in the Apostles times one was chosen from among the Presbyters.* Now surely the Apostle James was not *of the Presbyters meerly, or chosen from among them*; But to undeceave our *Informer* as to Bucers

cers judgment in this point, and to fortiſy the anſwer adduced, I ſhall preſent unto him that which *Bucer* aſſerts (*De Gub: Eccleſ:* p: 432.) viz, *That the Fathers call theſe firſt Proeſtotes or Moderators, yea even the Apoſtles themſelves,* Biſhops (N.B.) [*in a large & generall appellation*] *Becaus they firſt preached the goſpell to thoſe Churches, and that to prove a ſucceſſion of the true doctrine, they named the moſt eminent Miniſters the Biſhops, to ſhew that there was in theſe Churches a Conſtant tract from the Apoſtles both of ſound doctrine, & faithfull teachers thereof; Eminent, I ſay, for gifts, and zeale, or ſuffering for the goſpell (N. B.) not in any Epiſcopall authoritie except what was in that proſtaſie often mentioned.* Now whither *Bucer* was for ane Epiſcopacy in the higheſt degree even in the Apoſtles time, and the Epiſcopacy of *Iames*, Let any judge. And whither or not this *Informer* hath acquitt prelacie of being *both a groundleſſe, and godleſſe uſurpation in Gods Church* (as his now proſyleted Doubter ſayes he was taught to call it) the appeal is likwayes made to the judicious and impartiall, to judge from what is offered from the begining hereanent.

## Chap. XV.

### *Mr Durhams citations of the Fathers for evincing the identity of* Angel, Biſhop, *and* Preſbyter, *vindicat from the exceptions of this* Informer.

*Mr Durhame* in his excellent commentary upon the revelation (*pag.* 223.) having gone throw the Epiſtles, and embraced the ſylleptick ſenſe and acceptation of the word, *Angel*, preſents in a digreſſion ſeveral weighty and unanſwerable arguments, both from theſe Epiſtles, and parallel texts, to prove *the identity of angel, Biſhop, and Presbyter.* Which this *Informer* paſſes over *ſicco pede*, finding

them no doubt pills of too hard a digestion for his stomack. But *Mr. Durham* adding to his scripture-proofes of this important truth, Several clear testimonys of most eminent *Ancient fathers*, asserting the very same thing, then *Seria res agitur* with our *Informer*, and he bestirrs himself amain to take these weapons out of *Mr Durhams* hand, offering several exceptions against his testimonys, which (in vindication of the memory of so great a *Seer* from this pampleters imputations, and for the more full confirmation of this truth) we shal now examine and repell.

*Mr Durhame* sayes *That not only Jerome, but likewise others of the Ancients, such as Augustin, Ambrose, Chrysostom, were of Aerius minde hereanent.* To this he answers [*That Mr Durhame brings this as Medina's assertion, as he is cited by Bellarmin.* But knowes he not that *Medina* is cited for this by many others, as *Dr Reynolds* particularly. And likewise why would he not examine these Ancients cited by *Medina*, and examine what truth is in his citations, if he intended to repell this Testimony. Well, but what sayes our *Informer* to these Testimonies offered by Mr Durhame. He answers.

1. *That though these fathers be of Ieroms minde, i is no great prejudice that will hence ensue to Bishops, as he hath already cleared. Ans.* We have made it appear that *Jerome* makes the first Bishops, *meere fixed Moderators*, and likewise ane *humane invention* or *custom*, discrepant from ihe *first divine Bishops*, who are proved by him to be in Scripture *the same with Presbyters.* And if this be no prejudice to his *Diocesian Prelat with sole power of ordination and Jurisdiction*, let any judge.

2. The *Informer* wonders how *Mr Durhame* could cite *Augustin* as of *Arius* minde, since *Augustine* holds him to be erroneous upon this ground. (Hæres. 53. *Ans.* Why doth he not answer to that passage of *Augustin* cited by *Mr. Durhame*, as he pretends to answer to some of the rest of these fathers. What sayes he to *Augustins* words

words? are they not his? Or doe they not clearly assert the identity of Bishop & Presbyter? To say that *Augustin* accounted *Aerius* a heretick for this, while he offers not to remove *Augustins* cleare assertion of the same thing, is but to sett him by the ears with himself, not to answer his Testimony. Next, as for *Augustin's* accounting *Aerius a heretick for this*, he should know that the learned doe Consent that *Augustin* in this followes *Epiphanius*, who first imputed heresie to *Aerius*, and made but very simple insipid answers to *Aerius* arguments for his opinion. And moreover that *Augustin* relates his opinion anent the parity of Bishop and Presbyter, or rather his denying that their ought to be ane Ecclesiastick constitution anent their difference, *as that which Epiphanius put among the roll of heresies, himself* not *positively determining, that this was a heresie.* For (as is consented unto by the learned, and particularly by *Dr. Reynolds* in his letter to *Sir Francis Knolls*, touching Dr. *Bancrofts* Sermon about the difference betwixt Bishop and Presbyter) *Augustin* aknowledges himself ignorant *how farr the definition of heresie doth extend.* He *enumerats the heresies* which he found noted by other writers, but applyes not the *definition of heresie to everyone of them* Far lesse could he doe so in this point, which was his own judgement, as the passage cited by *Mr. Durham* doth evince. That *Ierom* and *Augustin* were of *Aerius* minde as to Bishops, is the judgment of very many: *Jane cum Aerio sensit Hieronimus* (*saith Whittak. Contr. 4. Q. 1. Cap. 3. Sect. 30.*) *Ierom truely was of Aerius minde, on which ground we need care the less that Aerius is so oft objected to us by blockish men.* See how rude *Whittaker* is again to our *Informer. Saravia* himself (de *Grad. cap. 23*) acknowledges *that Jerom dissented from Epiphanius in this.* Dr. *Reynolds* in that Epistle to *Knolls* about *Bancrofts Sermon*, asserting with the *Informer* [That *Aerius* was for his opinion condemned of heresie by the whole Church]

proves from *Jerom* and other writters who were contemporarie with Epiphanius or flouriſhed after him. *That Auguſtin Preſents that aſſertion anent the identite of Biſhop and Presbyter, as hereticall, only as he found it related by Epiphanius, whereas himſelf knew not how farr the name of hereſie was to be extended, as he teſtefys in his preface concerning hereſies.* But that *Auguſtin* himſelf was of the judgement *that by divine right, there is no difference betwixt Biſhop and Presbyter*, he proves from his words *Epiſt.* 19. he cites alſo ——— *Jewell* againſt *Harding* the jeſuit (aſſerting likwiſe with the *Informer* that *Aerius* was condemned for his opinion as a heretick) who proves that *Jerome, Auguſtin, Ambroſe*, were of the ſame minde. Thus wee ſee *Auguſtin* made in this point conſiſtent with *Jerome*, & alſo with himſelf, whom this man makes to ſpeake contradictions, ſo as he may come faire off.

3. He anſwers That *Ambroſe* and *Chryſoſtoms Teſtimony will not come Mr. Durhams length, Becaus, Though Ambroſe* [or one *Hilary*] *ſayes that Epiſcopi & Presbyteri una eſt ordinatio, that they are both prieſts, yet the Biſhop is the firſt, So that every Prieſt is not a Biſhop, for the Biſhop is the firſt prieſt. Ans.* The *Informer* hath left out wittily (whither honeſtly or not, let others judge) in his tranſlation of this ſentence, the inference which *Ambroſe* Drawes from this identity of the office, viz, that they *have both one ordination.* He maks the office one, and the ordination one conſequently, and gives this reaſon why they have one ordination, viz, becauſe, every one of them is a prieſt or Miniſter, *uterque enim Sacerdos*, ſath he: Their ordination, is terminat upon, and relative unto, *one and the ſame office.* Now what greater length would he have *Ambroſe* aſſertion come then this? *That there is no diffirent ordination of the Biſhop and Presbyter, and conſequently no officiall differences* doth he not plead for ane *officiall ſpecifick* d*ifference* betwixt Biſhop and Presbyter? Makes he not the

the Biſhops ſucceed the *Apoſtles* and *Evangeliſts* in their officiall power, and the Presbyters to come after the *seventy Diſciples* or meer ordinary Paſtoures? Are their not *many eſſential differences*, which this mans principles, & the preſent practiſe, fixes betwixt the Biſhop & Presbyter, wherof we have ſpoken above? How can *Ambroſe* then aſſert, *that they have the ſame office and ordination*? Where is the Conſecration? Where is the Biſhops ſole power in ordination and juriſdiction? Where is his negative voice among the Presbyters, making them in all their officiall power certain deputs under him, if their office be one, and their ordination the ſame with his?

2. As for the difference here aſſigned, viz, *That the Biſhop is the firſt prieſt, and that every Presbyter is not a Biſhop in Ambroſe ſenſe*, this will nothing help our *Informer*; Becaus 1. This is fitly applicable to the *Proeſtos* then in uſe, yea to the Moderator of a Synod, who (as ſuch) hath a ſort of *Proſtaſie* while the Synod ſits, and every Miniſter is not Moderator, though the Moderator be no more then a Miniſter in his officiall power; nay, this is applicable to the *leaſt accidentall difference Imaginable*. Every man is not white or black, yet every ſuch is a man. Every Parliament man is not ſpeaker, though the ſpeaker is a Parliament man only as to his authority. *Blondel* his firſt ordained Miniſter, who, with him, is the firſt *Biſhop* or *Proeſtos*, hath this properlie applicable unto him. 2. He muſt be minded, that Ambroſe ſayes, when ſpeaking of the Scriptur-parity of Biſhops and Presbyters, *non per omnia conveniunt ſcripta Apoſtolorum ordinationi quæ nunc eſt in Eccleſia. That the writings of the Apoſtles did not in every point agree to the order which was then in the Church.* Now this *preter-ſcripturall* or new order of government, what is it but that anent the *primus* or firſt among the Presbyters? ſo that this very *primus* or *proſtaſie* (tho farr from the preſent Hierarchie of our

Prelats as is ſaid) yet comes after *the ſcripture appointment* ——— with *Ambroſe*, and is *unlike to that paritie* betwixt Biſhop & Presbyter, which is therein held forth.

The *Informer* Next offers ſomething in anſwer to *Chryſoſtoms* Teſtimony, who aſſerts *That almoſt there is no difference betwix a Biſhop and Presbyter.* And his great Anſwer is *That notwithſtanding theſe Fathers acknowledge a difference, and themſelves were Biſhops*] *Anſ.* If the difference betwixt Biſhop and Presbyter come to *a ferme nihil*, or *almoſt none*, Surely it decays and is ready to vaniſh away. And what this difference is, and wherein placed, we have already heard; and ſurely that *proſtaſie* in *Chryſoſtoms* time, behoved to be very in conſiderable, ſince it came to make up no greater difference betwixt Biſhop and Presbyter then a *ferme nihil*, upon the borders of a *non ens*. As for what he ſayes *of their being Biſhops themſelves.* I anſwer, they are the more impartiall witneſſes in this mater; They tell us oft that *Ierome was a Presbyter, and therefore no friend to Biſhops.* Now here is a Teſtimonie *of eminent Biſhops* for this very truth which *Ierom* aſſerts, and which this man would make us believe, was condemned as a Hereſie. And ſurelie we are more tender of their reputation, who interpret any *Proſtaſie* or *Epiſcopacie* which they held, to be according to this their judgement anent Epiſcopacie, and aſſert that what overplus of power they had or might poſſibly exerciſe, beyond that of a Presbyter, was by them lookt upon as founded on *Eccleſiaſtick Cuſtome* or *Eccleſiæ uſus*, As *Auguſtin* ſpeaks, but not to flow from a divine right, Then this *Informer* and his fellowes, who make them maintaine one thing and practiſe another; yea and contradict themſelves ſo groſsly in maintaining as high a *jus divinum*, *as Apoſtolick doctrine*, *and practiſe*, in relation to the Hierarchicall Biſhop, and yet aſſert a *ferme nihil* as to the difference betwixt Biſhop and Presbyter.

But

But the *Informer* adds, *That they might think Bishop and Presbyter to differ Gradu, not ordine, in degree not in order, which is still a debate in the Schools. Ans.* This assertion is so improbable, that he dare but lisp it out, and faintly asserts it with *a might be*; But sure he must needs acknowledge this distinction of the Schooles to be much later then these Fathers, and any graduall difference which they place betwixt Bishop and Presbyter, it is clear, that they found it upon *Ecclesiastick Custome*, as we heard both *Jerome*, *Augustin* and *Ambrose* assert.

But how long will this man involve himself in contradictions, and these Fathers also? Told he us not (page 15.) *That Augustin upon Psal 45: 16. affirms, That the Bishops are properly the Successors of the Apostles unto their office.* And saith he not immediatly thereafter, *That Ambrose upon 1 Cor. 12: 28. affirms of the Apostles first named in that Classe of Church officers, that ipsi sunt Episcopi firmante illud Petro, episcopatum ejus accipiat alter. That the Apostles are the Bishops by Peters assertion, let another take his Bisheprick.* Tells he us not likewise here *that Augustin makes James the first Bishop of Jerusalem, and Peter, the first Bishop of Rome?* Tells he us not, *that they transmitted ane Episcopall power in that traine of Successors, proved by Catalogues of Bishops?* Did we not hear him plead, *that the seventy Disciples, placed in ane inferiour orb to the Twelve Apostles, are properlie succeeded by Presbyters; that Matthias behoved to be ordained ane Apostle, tho one of the Seventy disciples*, is his great argument to prove this. Now I beseech him *per omnes musas*, will he say that Apostles and Presbyters differ only *ordine* and not *gradu*, *in order*, *not in degree*? or that these fathers doe hold this opinion? how come their successors then to coalesce into one, after such a manner as to differ only in *a ferme nihil*, *or almost nothing*? Saith not Ambrose, *Episcopi & Presbyteri una est ordinatio*

*dinatio, the Bishop and Presbyter have the same ordination.* But the *Informer* will not adventure to say *that the Apostle and Presbyter have one ordination.* For *Matthias* one of the Seventy must be solemnlie by God ordained ane Apostle: And the Prelats must be solemnlie consecrat by their fellowes ——— μετα πολλας φαντασιας to their new episcopall order. In a word, we heard from *Cassander*, that the Canonists and Theologues who dispute this Question, doe both accord, that as to a *jus divinum* or divine right, there is no difference betwixt Bishop and Presbyter either in order or degree. And so though it were granted (which yet the *Informer* himself dare not positively assert) that the Fathers tossed this question, it will nothing help him, nor prejudge *Mr Durhams* quotation, which speaks of a *jus divinum.*

As for what he adds, *That the Fathers cited by Medina might hold the same notion,* Let him hear how *Bellarmin* (no friend to Presbyterian Government) represents his assertion (*de Cler. Cap* 15.) *Michael Medina lib.* 1. *De sacrorum hominum origine & eminentia* (*Cap.* 5.) *Affirmat sanctum Hieronimum idem omnino cum Arianis sensisse, neque solum Hieronimum in ea hæresi fuisse, sed etiam Ambrosium, Sedulium, Primasium, Chrysostomum, Theodoretum, Oecumenium, & Theophylactum, atque ita, inquit Medina, isti viri alioqui Sanctissimi, & Sacrarum Scripturarum consultissimi, quorum tamen sententiam prius in Ario, deinde in Waldensibus, postremo in Joanne Wickleffo, damnavit ecclesia.* That is, „ *Michael Medina* in the first book concerning the origi„ nall and eminencie of sacred men 5. Chap: Affirms „ that St *Jerome was every way of the same judgment with the* „ *Arians,* And that not only Jerome was in that Here„ sie. But also *Ambrose, Sedulius, Primasius, Chrysostom,* „ *Theodoret, Oecomenius, and Theophylact*; And thus „ (saith *Medina*) these men otherwayes most godly, and most

„moſt expert in the holie Scrptures, whoſe judgment „notwithſtanding the Church condemned, firſt in „*Aerius*, Next in the *Waldeneſes*, And laſtly in „*John Wickleff*. ] Let our *Informer* note here. 1. That it is beyond debate with *Bellarmin* that with *Medina* at leaſt, all theſe Fathers were *Aerians*. 2. That his holy Catholick Church of Rome is the grand condemner of this Hereſie. 3. That this is one of the Hereſies of the *old Waldenſes*, theſe famous witneſſes againſt Antichriſt: And of *John Wickleff*, and ſuch like eminent reformers. Afterward he adds [ *That in Jerome and theſe Greek Fathers, that opinion was of old diſſembled out of reverence to them, But contrarily in the Hereticks alwayes condemned.*] So we ſee *the Presbyterian Principles*, are with him, one of the *Hereſies of Proteſtants*. *Peter Swav.* ( in the *Hiſtory* of the Council of Trent, pag. 664. *edit. Francfort.* ) relates [ That when the Authoritie of *Jerom* and *Auguſtin* was brought to prove epiſcopacie to be but *ane Eccleſiaſtick conſtitution*, Michael Medina anſwered ——— „ That it was no wonder that *Jerom*, *Auguſtin*, and others of the Fathers, „fell into that hereſie, not having throughly ſearched „the matter, & that he maintained *pro virili* this to be their opinion.

*Finallie*, to make theſe Fathers one with themſelves ( whom this man enforceth in his next paſſages, cited page 71, 72. Anent the derivation of Epiſcopacie from the Apoſtles and higher, to ſpeak palpable contradictions) we muſt ſay, with *Whittaker*, that they call the Apoſtles ſo, becauſe they did that upon the matter which Biſhops then did. And becauſe their power *quadam ſimilitudine*, or *by a certain ſimilitude or likeneſſe* (as *Junius expreſſeth it*) was like to that of theſe extraordinarie Church officers, whom notwithſtanding they could not ſucceed in the ſame office, nor could theſe Fathers think ſo upon the grounds formerly

ly mentioned. *Tilen*, in his *Specul. Antichr. ortum aperiens* (*Aphoriſ.* 88.) Tells us that [*epiſcopos & Presbyteros re & nomine eoſdem fuiſſe, non Hieronimus ſolum in* 1. *Tim.* 3. *Sed etiam ſcriptura perſpicue docet Tit.* 1. Act. 20. *Phil.* 1. *Proinde humani inſtituti, ſive poſitivi, ut vocant juris, eſt illa ſub diverſis nominibus munerum diſtinctio.* „That Biſhops and Presbyters were the ſame „in *name* and thing or *office*, Not only *Jerome* on 1. „Tim. 3. But the Scripture alſo doth evidently teach, „Tit. 1. Act. 20. Phil. 1. And therefore that diſtinction „of the offices under diverſe names is of *human inſti-* „*tution*, as they call it, or of poſitive right] A fitt looking-glaſſe, this had no doubt been to the ſame *Tilen* when he wrote his *paræneſis*, and changed his note. And likwiſe it is a fitt looking glaſſe for this *Informer:*

## Chap. XVI.

*The harmonius conſent of ancient Fathers, Modern divines, and confeſſions of Reformed Churches for Presbyterian Government, in all its eſſentiall points of difference from Prelacie, is exhibit.*

IT is clear that Presbyterian Government (the pure, ancient, and genuine Government of this Church) in every eſſentiall ingredient of it, as it ſtands in oppoſition to prelacie, *is approved by ſuch a conſent of antiquity, and modern diuines*, that it would take up almoſt as much roome as this Informers pamphlet, to reckon up their names. That we may preſent them in a compendious view take it thus.

1. That

1. That *jure divino, there is no difference betwixt a Biſhop and Presbyter*, hath a very large conſent of antiquitie collected by many of the learned, whoſe teſtimonies we may ſee in Biſhop *Jewel* againſt *Hardin*, edit: Ann. 1570. p. 243. And *Reynolds* in the forementioned Epiſtle at large cited (*Petries Hiſt. part.* 3. p: 469, 470, 471.) Where there is exhibit a full conſent both of the Greek, and Latin Fathers, for this point of truth. The Doctor in his conference with Hart, holds *That the preſident choſen out at firſt to moderat, is he whom afterwards the Fathers called* Biſhop, *and that the name Biſhop common to all Miniſters, was by them thus appropriat to this preſident.* Next for modern writers, the ſame Dr *Reynolds* tells us in the formentioned Epiſtle, that thoſe who have laboured about the reforming of the Church theſe 500 Years, have taught that all Paſtours be they intituled Biſhops or Prieſts, *have equall authoritie and power by Gods word.* Citing the *Waldenſes in Æn. Silv. hiſt. of Bohem. Chap.* 35. *Pich. Hierarch. Eccleſiaſt. lib.* 2. *Cap:* 10. *Marſil. Patavin. Defenſ. pacis part.* 2. *Cap.* 15. *Wickleff. in Thom. Waldenſ. Doct. Fil. Tom. 1. lib:* 2. *Cap:* 60. *and Tom:* 2. *cap:* 7. *And his Schollers Huſſe and the Huſſits*, Æneas Silvius *Loc. cit. Luther. Adverſ. falſo: nomin: Scot:* Epiſc. *& adverſus Papat. Rom. Calv. in* Epiſt. *ad Phil. Tit.* 1. *Erentius Apolog. Confeſſ. Wittenberg.* —— *Cap.* 21: *Bullinger. Decad.* 5. *Serm:* 3. *Muſculus Loc. Com: Tit: de Miniſterio Verbi. Then he adds Jewel, Pilkington, Dr. Humphrey in Campian. & Duræum Jeſuit. Part.* 2. *Rat:* 3. *Whitak. ad rationes Campian.* 6. *& Confut Duræ. lib.* 6. *Mr Bradfoord, Lambert, Fox* (*Act. Mon.*) *Fulk.* (*Anſr. to the Rhemeſits.*) To theſe may be added *Cartwright* againſt the *Rhemiſts. Biſhop Bilſon himſelf againſt Seminaries lib.* 1. *p:* 318.. *Biſhop Morton in his Catholick Apologie Part.* 1. *Cap.* 33. *Eraſmus upon* 1 *Tim.* 4. *To which add, that in the Oecumenick Counceles of Conſtance & Baſile*

Baſile, *it was concluded that Presbyters ſhould have deciſive ſuffrage in Councils, as well as* Biſhops, *becauſe that by the Law of God* Biſhops *were not greater then they, and it is expreſlie given them. Act.* 15. 23. To which we may add the *Concil. Aquiſgravenſe ſub Ludovico Pio Imperatore.* 1. *Anno* 816. Which approved it for ſound divinity out of Scripture, that Biſhops *and Presbyters are equal*; bringing the ſame texts that *Aerius* doth. To theſe mentioned the learned *Reynolds* doth add, *the common judgement of Reformed Churches, viz. Helvetia, Savoy, France, Scotland, Germanie, Hungary, Poland, the Low Countries, citing the harmonie of Confeſſions.* Yea their own Church of England (Chap: 11. of the harmonie.) Therafter he learnedly refutes our *Informer* as to what he ſayes anent *Ieroms* (ſo often repeated) *a Marco Evangeliſta* —— ſhewing both by the decree of the 4t. *Council of Carthage Cap*: 3. *Anent Presbyters intereſt in ordination (which, ſaith he, proves that the* Biſhops *ordained not then alone in all places, although Ierom ſayes, quid facit excepta ordinatione &c*:) *and by Ieroms proving* Biſhops *and Presbyters to be all one in ſcripture, and even in the right of ordination* 1. *Tim.* 4. 14. *That Ierom could not mean* Biſhops *in Alexandria to have had that Epiſcopall power ſince Mark, about which the queſtion is.* Where alſo he vindicats Calvin (*Inſtit*: l: 4. c: 4. Sect: 2.) cited by *Bancroft* (as likwayes by our *Dialogiſt* here) *as conſenting to the eſtabliſhment of ane Epiſcopacie ſince Mark* „ *at Alexandria.* „ He ſaith [That Calvin having „ ſhowen that Miniſters chooſe out one to preſide, to „ whom eſpecially they gave the name of [Biſhop,] „ Shews that notwithſtanding this Biſhop *was not above them in honour and dignitie, that he ſhould rule over them, but was appointed only to ask the votes, to direct and admoniſh* —— *and ſee that performed which was* „ *agreed upon by their common conſent* —— „ And ha- „ ving declared, that *Ierom* ſhews this to have been brought

in by the consent of men upon Tit. 1. He adds, „ that the same *Ierom* other where shews, how an- „ cient ane order in the Church it was, even from „ Marks time to *Heraclius* &c: *In which words of Calvin* (saith the Doctor) *seeing that the order of the Church which he mentions, hath evident relation to that before described, and that in the describing of it he had said, The Bishop was not so above the rest in honour that he had rule over them: It followes that Mr. Calvin doth not so much as seem to confess upon* Ieroms *report* [that *ever since Marks time Bishops have had a ruling superioritie over the Clergie*] A contradictorie Conclusion to that of our *Informer*. The Doctor proceeds thus. *Wherfore to use no more proofs in a thing manifest, which else might be easily proved more at large out of Ierom and Mr. Calvin both, it is certain that neither of them doth affirme, that Bishops so long time have had such a superioritie, as Dr. Bancroft seems to father upon them.* To all this adde, that *Dr. Holland* the Kings professor in *Oxford*, at ane Act (*Iully* 9. 1608.) Concluded against Mr *Lanes* question [*an Episcopatus sit ordo distinctus a Presbyteratu, eoque superior jure divino. That is, whither Episcopacie be a distinct order from the Presbyterat & superiour thereunto by divine right*] That the *affirmative was most false, against the Scriptures, Fathers, the doctrin of the Church of England, yea the very Schoolmen themselves, Lombard, Thomas, Bonaventur.*

A 2d. Essentiall point of Presbyterian government in opposition to Prelacie, is in the mater of ordination and jurisdiction, viz, *that these are not in the hand of any single Prelat, but that Presbyters have ane essentiall joynt interest therin.* And this also hath a large Consent and Testimonie of the learned both ancient and Modern. For this the 4t. *Council of Carthage is adduced Can. 5. and the Councils of Constance and Basile, anent Presbyters decisive suffrages in Council. Cyprian Epist. 33. and 78. Council of Antioch, Can:*

10. of Aneyra. Can. 13. Ruffins hiſt. lib. 10. Cap. 9. Sozom. l. 2. c. 23. and many ſuch. Smectim. pag. 28, 29, 30, 31. cites many Teſtimonies for this. See Blondel. Apol. Sect. 3. pag. 120. to 130. Prins un-Biſh: of Timothie and Titus from pag. 52. to 83. Where the full Conſent of reformed divines is adduced, ſuch as Ioannes Luckawits in his confeſſion of the Taborits againſt Rokenzana Cap: 13. the Waldenſes and Taborits apud Fox acts. Monum. p. 210. Illyric. Catol. teſtium veritatis. Tit. Waldenſes 455. Melanchton, Arg. & Reſponſ. par. 7. De Poteſt. Epiſcopi Arg. 2. Hiperius on 1. Tim. 4. 14. Hemmingius ibid. Gerardus Loc. Theol. de Miniſterio Eccleſiaſtico proves this at large. Peizelius, Arg. & Reſp. Par. 7. de Ordin. Miniſtrorum in Arg. 1. Muſculus, Loc: Com. de Miniſterio verbi. Mornay Lord of Pleſs. de Eccleſ. Cap 11. Nay Canoniſts and Schoolmen themſelves, Summa angelica ordo, Sect: 13. and Innocentius there cited. Filiucius Jeſuit. de Caſibus Conſc. Par. 1. Tract. 9. Alexander Alenſis Sum. Theol. par. 4. Queſt. 9: M. 5. Artic. 1. Cajetan. on 1. Tim. 4. 14. and many others. Likwiſe it is made good that the Biſhops ſwallowing up this power of Presbyters, and reſerving it only to himſelf comes from Popiſh Authority. Leo primus (Epiſt. 88.) on complaints of unlawfull ordinations writing to the German and French Biſhops, reckons up what things are reſerved to the Biſhops, and among the reſt *Presbyterorum & diaconorum conſecratio*, the conſecration of Presbyters and deacons. Then adds, *quæ omnia ſolis deberi ſummis pontificibus authoritate Canonum præcipitur.* That is, *All which things are commanded to be reſerved to the cheife prieſts by the Authority of the Canons.* For this ſee alſo Rabanus Maurus de Inſtit. Clericorum. l. 1. c. 6. And to this truth of Presbyters power in ordination, the Confeſſions of reformed Churches gives a harmonious echo. The latter confeſſion of Helvetia (Harmon. of Confeſs Chap. 11. pag: 232.) afferts,

aſſerts, *That the holy function of the Miniſtery is given by the laying on of the hands of Presbyters*, no word of Pre-
„ lats hands. So the 18. *Chap:* (*pag.* 236.) they ar-
„ to be ordained by publick prayer and laying on of
„ hands, which power they ſay *is the ſame and alike in*
„ *all*, citing that paſſage Luke. 10. he that will be great
„ among yow, let him be your ſervant. So Act.
„ 15. and *Ierom* on Tit. 1. —— therfor (ſay they) let
„ no man forbid that we return to the *old appoint-*
„ *ment of God* (ſo they call the Presbyterian way of
„ ordination) *and rather receive it then the Cuſtome devi-*
*ſed by men*, (So they call the Epiſcopall Method). Thus the Confeſſion of B*ohem.* Chap. 9. (*Harm. Sect:* 11 *pag.* 246. 247.) after ſetting down the qualifications of Miniſters —— As to *ordination* they ſay, that after prayer and faſting they are to be *confirmed and approved of the Elders by the laying on of their hands.* So the *Confeſs. Sax: Chap:* 12. (*Harm: Conf: par.* 2.) affirme that it belongs to *Miniſters of the word to ordaine Miniſters, lawfullie elected and called.* Where we have aſſerted both the *Presbyters power* in ordination, and *the peoples intereſt in the Call of Paſtors*, in oppoſition to prelacy. So the Confeſſion of the *French Church. Cre-*
„ *dimus veram Eccleſiam &c:* „ We believe that the
„ true Church ought to be governed by that policy
„ which Chriſt hath ordained, viz, that there be Pa-
„ ſtours, Presbyters or Elders and Deacons. And
„ again we believe *that all true paſtours* wherever
„ they be, *are endued with equal and the ſame power under*
„ *one head and Biſhop Chriſt Ieſus*, which ſtrikes our
„ Dioceſian and Eraſtian frame of government ſtarke dead. Which is ſeconded thus by the *Belgick Confeſſ.* (Art: 30.) All Chriſts Miniſters of the word of God have *the ſame and equal power and authority as being all Miniſters of that only univerſall head and Biſhop Chriſt.* To theſe we might adde many other Teſtimonies of re-

formed divines, as *Calvin*, *Piſcator*, *Marlorat on* 1. *Tim*: 4. 14. *Tit.* 1. 3. *Zanch. de Statu. Peccat. and Legal. in 4tum. præcep. Chemnitius Loc. Com. Part.* 3. *de Eccleſ. Cap.* 4. *Exam. Concil. Trid. part.* 2. *de Sacram. ordinis pag.* 224, 225. *proving alſo that Election and vocation of Miniſters belongs to the whole Church. Antonius Sadael, Reſp. ad repetita Turriani Sophiſmata, par.* 2. *loc.* 12. *Beza* (*de diverſ: Miniſtrorum gradibus.*) *Junius* [*Controv.* 5. *l. c* 3. *N*: 3.] *Chamierus* [*Panſtratia Cathol: Tom*: 2. *de Oecum: Pontiſ: Cap*: 6.

A 3d. Great point of Presbyterian Government in oppoſition to prelacie, is *the peoples intereſt in the election and call of Miniſters.* And for this there is as full a conſent of divines, and Churches, both ancient and Modern. Severall of the forementioned Confeſſions clears this, the peoples election and call being taken in together with Presbyters ordination. *Cyprian* (*Epiſt.* 68.) is full to this purpoſe. *Plebs ipſa maxime habet poteſtatem, vel eligendi dignos ſacerdotes, vel indignos recuſandi, quod & ipſum videmus de divina authoritate deſcendere ut Sacerdos ſub omnium oculis, plebe preſente deligatur, & dignus atque idoneus publico judicio ac Teſtimonio comprobetur.* That is, „ The people „ themſelves have Chiefly the power, either of Ele„ cting worthy prieſts, or refuſing the unworthy: „ which mater we ſee even of it ſelf to deſcend from „ the divine authority, that the prieſt be ſet apart „ under the eyes of all in the peoples preſence, and as „ worthy and qualified be approved by a publick judg„ ment and Teſtimony. So lib: 1. Epiſt: 4. is full for the Churches libertie and right in elections. The 4t. Council of Carthage [Can. 22.] Requires to the admiſſion of every Clergy man, *civium aſſenſum, & teſtimonium & convenientiam*, The conſent of the citizens, their teſtimonie, and agreement *Socrat* [l. 4. c. 25. ſayes that Ambroſe was choſen

chosen Bishop of *Millan* by the uniform voice of the Church. In the pretended Apostolick, but truely old constitutions of *Clement* [lib. 8. cap. 4.] The Bishop who must be ordained is appointed in all things to be unblameable, *chosen by all the people*; unto ,, whom let the people being assembled on the Lords ,, day (N. B.) with the Presbytery and the Bishops there ,, present, give their consent: And a Bishop askes ,, πρεσβυτεριον και τον λαον, the Presbytery, & the people', ,, if they desire such a man to be set over them. The *Helvetick* confession told us, that the right chooſing of Ministers is *by consent of the Church*. So the Belgick confession tells us [that Ministers, Elders, and Deacons, are to be advanced to their office *by the lawfull election of the Church*.] *Greg. Nazian.* (orat. 31.) commends *Athanasius* his calling as being after the Apostolical example ψηφῳ του λαου παντος, by the suffrage of all the people. *Blondel* clears this from a large consent of antiquitie (page, 379. to 473.) And this is cleared also by a large consent of protestant divines. *Luther* (*de potest. Papæ.*) *Calvin* (on Act. 6: 3.) *Beza* (confess. Cap. 5. Art. 35.) *Musculus* (in Loc. com.) *Zanch.* (on 4t. com.) *Junius* (Animadvers. on *Bellarm.* Controv. 5. l. c. 7.) *Cartwright* (on Act. 14. v. 23.) *Wallæus*, *Bullinger*, *Wittaker*. *See* Mr *Gilesp.* *Misc. quest. pag* 18, 19. Our first book of Discipline appoints to the people their *votes and suffrage in election of Ministers*. (*in the* 4t. *head.*) And the 2d. book (Cap 3.) discharges any to intrude [*contrary to the will of the congregation* ——— *or without the voice of the eldership*.

A 4t. Essential point of Presbyterian Government in oppositon to Prelacie, is in relation to *the office of the ruleing elder, as appointed by Christ*. This we cleared from Scripture, and there is as cleare a consent of antiquitie for it, and of modern reformed Churches and divines, ex-

hibited by our writers. For this *Ignatius* (*Epiſt: ad Trallianos, ad initium pag. 66. edit. oxon.* An. 1644.) is cited. Likewiſe *Baronius* (in his *Annals* Anno 103. in the *Geſta purgationis Cæciliani & Felicis.*) *Tertul.* (*Apolog. Adverſ: gentes. Cap. 39.*) *Origen.* (*contra Celſum lib. 3.*) *Cyprian* (*Epiſt. 36.*) *Optatus* (*lib. 1. pag. 41. edit: pariſ: An. 1631.*) *Ambroſe* (*comment. on* 1 *Tim.* 5: 1.) And for modern writers, *Whittaker* (contra *Duræum* lib: 9. Sect. 47.) Thorndicks diſcourſe of religious aſſemblies (cap. 4. pag. 117.) Rivet (*Cathol. Orthodox, Tract. 2. queſt. 22, Sect. 4*).

*Finally.* Presbyterian Government, as it ſtands in oppoſition to the preſent Prelacie *in its Eraſtian mould*, and maintaines a ſpirituall authoritie in the hands of Church officers, *diſtinct from, and independent upon the civill powers of the world*, hath as full a conſent of the learned. As Eraſtianiſm was firſt hatched by *Thomas Eraſtus* Phyſician in Heidleberg about the year 1568. —— And much catched up, and pleaded for by *Arminians* ſince, ſo it hath been impugned by a full conſent of reformed divines, who have fully proved it to be contrary to the rules of Church Government ſet down in the Scripture both in the old and new Teſtament, and utterly everſive of the Goſpel Miniſtrie and Church. The eminent divines who have written againſt it, are *Beza* (who encounters with *Eraſtus* himſelf upon this point) *Zachrias urſin, Wallæus, Helmichius, Triglandus, Dr Revius, Dr Voetius, Appollonius*, and many others, Eſpecially the famous and learned *Mr Gilleſpy* in that elaborat peice, entituled, *Aarons rod bloſſoming*; wherein the conſent of the ancient, and modern Church, as to this great point of truth, is exhibit. See 2. *book.* 1 *Cap. pag.* 167.

Now, from all that is ſaid, Whither Presbyterian Government hath not the patronage of the pureſt Scripture antiquity, and a full conſent of the after pu-

rer times, and of reformed Churches and divines, in all the forementioned points of its oppoſition to the Prelacie now eſtabliſhed: Both in holding, 1. The identity of Biſhop and Presbyter, as to *name* and *thing*. 2. Presbyters right of ordination, and Juriſdiction. 3. The peoples intereſt in the Election, and call of Miniſters. 4. The ruleing Elders office. 5. The Churches intrinſick power of Government, I leave to the Impartiall to judge. And conſequently of the vanity of this new *Dialoguiſt*, His pleading upon this point.

A

Confutation

*Of the Second*

# DIALOGUE,

Anent the Covenants

*Againſt*

EPISCOPACIE.

*Wherein, the* Informers *reaſonings againſt the abjuration of the preſent* Epiſcopacie *in the National and Solemne League and* Covenant, *and the obligation of theſe oaths in oppoſition thereunto, are examined.*

## Chap. I.

*A twofold ſtate of the Queſtion propoſed, the one touching the abjuration of this Prelacie in either or both theſe Covenants, the other concerning the obligation of theſe oaths againſt it. That Prelacie is abjured in the National and Solemne League and Covenant, proved at large. And arguments offered to evince their oblidging force upon the preſent and ſucceeding generations.*

THE ſtate of the Queſtion in the *Second Dialogue* is twofold, 1. *Whither the Prelacie now eſtabliſhed by Law in this Church, be abjured in the national, and ſolemne league and Covenant?* 2. *Upon ſuppoſition that it is abjured in both the one and the other, whither the obligation of theſe Oaths ſtands againſt it, yea or not?* Wee ſhall a litle touch.

For the 1. Our National Covenant, ſworne by *King James* in the the year 1580, and by the Eſtates of this land, and many times thereafter, ſolemnlie and univerſallyrenewed, both by our Church and State, doth clearly exclude Prelacie. The paſſages thereof pleaded againſt Prelacie, and wherein our obligation lyes, are theſe. 1. In General, wee profeſſe to believe „ *the word of God to be the onlie rule,* the Goſpel contained „therein to be Gods undoubted truth, as then received „in this Land & maintained by ſundrie reformed Kirks „& States, cheiflyby our own. Whereupon we renounce „ all contrary doctrine, and eſpecially *all kind of Papiſtrie „ in generall & particular heads, as confuted by the word of God „ and rejected by the Kirk of Scotland.* 2. After a large enu„meration of many points of poprie, diſowned upon this ground and vowed againſt, as contrary unto the word of God, and the goſpel of Salvation contained

tained therein. „ Wee renounce *the Popes worldly* „ *monarchie, and wicked Hierarchie, and whatever hath* „ *been brought into this Church without, or againſt the* „ *word of God.* 3. Wee vow to joyne our ſelves to this „ reformed Kirke in Doctrine, faith, religion & Diſci- „ pline; Swearing by the great name of God to con- „ tinue in obedience to *the doctrine, and Diſcipline of this* „ *Kirke*, and upon our Eternall perill to maintaine „ and defend the ſame according to our vocation, and „ power, all the dayes of our life.

Now the obligation of this engadgement againſt prelacie is evident theſe wayes. 1. *All doctrines contrary unto, or beſide the word of God*, are here rejected and diſowned: All doctrines contrary to the ſimplicity of the Goſpel, recived and believed by the Church of Scotland, and whatever hath been brought into this Church without or againſt Gods Word. But ſo it is that the preſent hierarchy is contrary unto the Word of God, both in its Dioceſian and Eraſtian mould, as hath been proved at large. And we heard that this Church of Scotland, ſince it received Chriſtianity, did ſtand for a long time under Presbyterian Government, and untill *Palladius* was ſent unto us from Pope *Celeſtine*, never knew a Prelat, Ergo, Prelacie in its Dioceſian Eraſtian mould is here abjured.

2. Our Prelacie is condemned in that clauſe of the *Popes wicked hierarchie*, whereby the Prelatick Government is moſt clearly pointed at, which is evident thus. 1. That the Government of the popiſh Church *is prelaticall*: this man will not deny, it is by Arch-Biſhops, Biſhops, Primats Deans &c: and it being diſtinct from *his Monarchie*, for elſe the naming of his worldly monarchie had been enough: and moreover, it being ranked among theſe things which are brought into the Church *againſt the Word of God*, and into this Church *againſt her pure Doctrine* which was clearly the

ſenſe

ſenſe of it, that aſſemblies, and the body of this Proteſtant Church entertained; aſſemblies declaring that the Word [*Biſhop*] *was not to be taken as in time of Papiſtrie.* And *Iohn Knox* (whoſe ſenſe and Judgement herein was certanlie retained, and upon all occaſions manifeſted by our Reformers) accounting Prelacie to have *quid commune cum Antichriſto.* Ergo, Prelacie is here vowed againſt ſimpliciter and in it ſelf conſidered. 2. If he grant *a hierarchie* to be here abjured, ſure it muſt be abjured with the reſt of the corruptions enumerat in that large liſt of them exhibited in this Oath. Now theſe are abjured *in themſelves ſimpliciter, as contrary unto the Word of God and the doctrine of this Kirke, ergo,* So muſt *a prelacie* or *hierarchie* be in its ſelf abjured under the ſame *formalis ratio,* as thus brought in, whither by the Pope or any other. 3. This *hierarchie* is ſuppoſed in this Oath to be contrary unto the *Diſcipline of this Church,* as well as the popiſh Doctrine is therein ſuppoſed contrarie *to her pure Doctrine.* Now (as we ſhall ſhew) the Diſcipline which this Church then owned, was Presbyterian. So that that Diſcipline or Hierarchie, which ſtands in oppoſition to Presbyterian Government, is here abjured: but ſo it is that prelacie *ex ſe, & ſua natura* ſtands thus oppoſit unto it, ergo, by the hierarchie, all prelacy is abjured.

3. Prelacy is abjured in that clauſe where we pro-
„feſſe „ to joyne our ſelves to this reformed Kirk
„in her *Diſcipline*, as well as her *Doctrine*, and vow and
„ſweare adherence unto both. Now that the Diſcipline then owned by this Church, was Presbyterian Government or diſcipline, Is evident theſe wayes. 1. Diſcipline by generall aſſemblies and Synods having compleat parity of all Miniſters, with a joynt deciſive ſuffrage, is Presbyterian Diſcipline; but this was that Diſcipline owned by our Church: For her

firſt

firſt Nationall Aſſembly (compleatly Presbyterial in its mould) was in the Year 1560. After which time untill 1580 When this Covenant was ſworne, there were many aſſemblies exerciſing their power. 2, That is presbyterian Diſcipline, which did judicially condemne prelacie as having no warrand in the Word, and ownes no Church officers as lawfull but paſtours, Doctors, Elders and Deacons. But ſo it is that this was the judiciall deciſion of our generall aſſemblies, long before this Covenant; for the firſt book of diſcipline, containing the Baſis of presbyterian Government, was approved and ſubſcribed by this Church in the year 1560. And the Second book of diſcipline in Anno 1578. Which two books compleatly overthrow Prelacie, & layes down a mould of Presbyterian government. And therafter in the aſſembly at Dundie (Anno. 1580. Seſſ. 4.) The office of a Prelat was particularly condemned by a ſolemne act, and aboliſhed as unlawfull, and void of Scripture warrand, ordaining *under paine of excommunication ſuch as brooked the ſaid office to lay it aſide, as ane office to which they are not called of God, and ceaſe from preaching and adminiſtring Sacraments, under hazard of the ſame Cenſure; or uſing the office of a Paſtour till they receive admiſſion [de novo] from the generall aſſemblie.* Now in the nationall covenant, this exiſtent diſcipline being ſworne to be maintained, who can ſay but that Prelacie is moſt formallie abjured therein; Eſpecially if it be conſidered, that in the ſame year 1580 This national covenant was ſworn, at which time theſe things were ſo freſh & recent. 3. That diſcipline which the takers and framers of this covenant, at the taking of it, and in purſuance of its ends, did carry on and eſtabliſh, that diſcipline it muſt needs include and engadge unto in their ſenſe: but that was Presbyterian government. For (to omit many preceeding diſcoveries heirof mentioned in the Apology) in the

year

year 1580. The assemblie after their judiciall declarator, that Prelacie is contrary to the word of God, sent Commissioners to the King to desire the establishment of the book of policie by ane Act of Council, untill a parliament were conveened; and what this book of policie contained, we did already hint. Then in this same year, the national covenant and confession is sworn by the King and Council. In the assemblie 1581. it is subscribed by all the members, and the Act of the Assemblie at *Dundie* explained. And it was again judicially declared *that the Church did thereby wholly Condemne the estate of Bishops as they were in Scotland.* At which very Nick of time the Confession of faith (Sworn before in the year 1580.) is presented to the assemblie by the King and Council, Together with his Letter to Noblemen and Gentlemen for erecting Presbyteries Compleatly through the nation, and dissolving Prelacies, all the three, viz, both the King, the Estates and the assemblie, fully agreeing in this judgement as to Church government, and this oath for its maintenance. And according to this joynt authoritative determination of Church and State, Presbyteries were erected. Likwise in this assemblie according to the forsaid joynt conclusion, the Second book of discipline containing the mould of Presbyterial Government, and likewise this National Covenant and oath for its perservation, are (as the two great Charters of our Churches government and liberties) insert into the Churches records *ad futuram rei memoriam*, And that posterity might not be ignorant of the discipline sworn in that covenant. Upon which, and many such like grounds, the Assemblie 1638 did again judicially declare this sense of this National Oath, which accordingly was received with ane expresse application to prelacy, and the other Corruptions attending it, and

and taken by the whole land with a full concurrence of the civil Sanction and authoritie, Anno. 1640.

The 2d. Great engadgement pleaded againſt prelacie, is that of *the Solemne League and covenant*: Wherin we vow *the preſervation of the reformed religion of the Church of Scotland in Doctrine, Worship, Diſcipline and government according to the word of God, and the example of the beſt reformed Churches.* In the *Second Article*, Wee ſweare *the extirpation of poprie and prelacie, Arch-Bishops, Bishops, their Chancellours and Commiſſaries &c. And all Eccleſiaſticall officers depending on that Hierarchie ——— of whatever is found contrary to ſound Doctrine and the power of godlineſs.* Which engadgement hath been likwiſe taken by *all rancks*, by Parliaments, Aſſemblies, and the body of the people. Now that the Prelacie at this time eſtabliſhed is abjured in this engadgement, is theſe wayes Evident.

1. Prelacie being razed in Anno. 1638. according to our national covenant, and ane engadgement being framed of adherence to the Religion eſtabliſhed in Doctrine, worſhip, diſcipline and Government, in oppoſition unto all innovations formerly introduced, and upon both grounds, Presbyterian government, in its exact paritie being ſett up, and judicially enacted, both by Aſſemblie and parliament: that the Solemne league muſt needs ſtrike againſt Prelacie, is in this apparent, becauſe this league is clearlie referable to the great ends of the national covenant, as it ſtood then eſtabliſhed, explained and Sworne by this whole nation; and therfor is ane acceſſorie engadgement, commenſurat unto, and to be explained by the preceeding: and conſequently none can doubt that it ſtrikes againſt prelacie, and engadgeth to Presbyterian government, who knowes how former engadgements ſtood.

2. The

2. The preſervation of the Doctrine, worſhip, Diſcipline and goverment then exiſtent in Scotland, referring to the then eſtabliſhment therof, in oppoſition to the former prelacie and all its corruptions; Its evident that all ſort of prelacie & whatever corruption in Government is inconſiſtent with Presbyterian ſimplicity and parity, is here abjured and covenanted againſt. As we engadge the preſervation of the Doctrine and worſhip as then reformed, from Prelatick innovations, ſo likewiſe we ſweare to preſerve our Churches ancient and pure diſcipline as it ſtood then recovered from prelatick encroachments. That diſcipline & government is here ſworne unto, as the diſcipline and government of the Church of Scotland, which the Church and State of Scotland at this time eſtabliſhed and owned: But ſo it is, that that was Presbyterian government, then fully ratified both by Church and State, Ergo, the preſervation of Preſbyterian government is ſworne; and by further conſequence that government which was by Church and ſtate extirpate, as abjured in the nationall covenant, and contrary unto this Presbyterian frame, was likwiſe abjured and covenanted againſt in this league. But ſuch was prelacie, Biſhops, Arch-Biſhops &c: ergo. Again.

3. The great ground upon which our adverſaries deny the national Covenant to ſtrike againſt prelacie, is, that they hold that the then exiſtent diſcipline, to which in that Oath we vow adherence as the diſcipline of this Church, was not Presbyterian government, & that King *James* did not own it. Ergo, (by ane argument *a contrariis*, and *ad hominem*) ſince its undenyable with them that *de facto* Presbyterian government was now enacted, ratified, eſtabliſhed and ſett up, both by Aſſemblies and King and Parliament, that goverment we muſt ſtand oblidged unto by the ſolemn league, as the

as the reformed discipline and government of this Church, and contrarily that government which was then *de facto* by assemblies, King and Parliament razed as inconsistent with Presbyterian government, and as abjured in the nationall Covenant, that government wee cannot deny, but the solemne league stricks against. But so it is that prelacie was at this time razed by Assemblies, King and Parliament, as inconsistent with the nationall covenant, and Presbyterian governmeut then established, ergo this solemne league stricks against Prelacie.

4. The word *preserve* here used ——— and the expression *of common enemies* cleares this further: *preserving* relates to that which one is *in possession of*, the common enemies of this possession, in the sense of all, both Imposers and engadgers, are the Prelats and their Malignant Agents, so that the holding fast of what was attained in point of reformation &c: Presbyterian government in all its established priviledges against Prelats, Prelacie, and all the incroachements thereof, is here most evidently engadged unto.

5. That engadgement and oath which they who have set up prelacie in our Church, did Cassat and remove, as inconsistent therewith, that must needs, by their own confession strike against it: but so it is, that our Parliament and Rulers did wholly Cassat this solemne league, in order to the establishing of Prelacie. Ergo, by their own confession it strikes against it. They cassat the nationall covenant onlie as interpreted against Prelacie, supposing that it will not in *its self* strike against it, but the league they *simply abjure*, and disclaime its obligation as to a change of this Prelacie: Ergo they doe upon the mater acknowledge that it stricks against it.

*Finaly*, Our adversaries doe grant that it strikes against Bishops, Arch-Bishops, Deans &c: That

we are bound therby to extirpat ſuch officers, though its onlie that *ſpecifick complex forme* expreſſed in the Second Article, which they think is properlie abjured. But 1. Is it not a prelacie inconſiſtent with Presbyterian government (which we engadge to preſerve in the First Article) which wee abjure and engage to extirpat in the Second, and under this formalis ratio, as thus inconſiſtent, in the ſenſe and judgement of our Church and State (the Impoſers of the Oath)? And are not Biſhops, Arch-Biſhops, Deans &c: contrary to Presbyterian government, then in being? 2. Dare this man or any of that partie deny but that the former prelacie which we had in Scotland was intended to be abjured by our Church and State, and the Impoſers and renewers of this oath, and doe not all engagements bind according to the ſenſe of Impoſers, in the judgement of Caſuiſts? 3. Is not our Government now by two Arch-Biſhops and twelve Biſhops? Have not theſe their Deans, Archdeacons, Chanters &c? 4. Are not our Prelats reſtored to all their pretended priviledges, taken from them by the Parliament who Impoſed this oath? Nay redintegrat to a more abſolute poſſeſſion of pretended Spirituall authority then ever any befor them poſſeſſed ſince our reformation? 5. Are we not engadged to extirpat *all Eccleſiaſtick officers depending upon that hierarchie*, as we are engaged againſt *whatſoever is contrary to ſound Doctrine and the power of godlineſſe* not in bulk onlie, but every thing *Sigillatim* upon this ground, and *formalis ratio?* And dare any of them deny that in the ſenſe of Impoſers, a dioceſian Biſhop or Arch-Biſhop (eſpecially as their power now ſtands enlarged and qualified) is contrary to ſound doctrine, and the power of godlines? Dare he ſay that any of the Impoſers judged ane Arch-Biſhop, or Biſhop, eſpecially in ſuch ane Eraſtian mould as he is now, to be conſiſtent

ſtent with the word of God? Sure he were very Impudent who would aſſert it.

This being clear then, that theſe engadgements leavells againſt the preſent Prelacie, let us point out Next, their obliging force.

This will be clear, if we conſider theſe oaths. 1. In their *forme* or *formalis ratio*, or nature and eſſence. 2. In relation to their *ſubject whom they affect*. 3. In their *mater and object*. 4. *Their end and deſigne.*

1. In their *Forme*, and that either in relation to ſeverall ſorts of tyes included in them. Or 2. The Qualifiations of theſe tyes. For the 1. They are *oaths* wherin God is invocked as a witneſſe of our ſinceritie, and as a ſwift witneſs againſt us if we breake. The Scripture is full in pointing at the Sacred nature of oaths. The Third command of that fiery law which Gods own voice pronounced from Heaven; and which his finger wrote upon the Tables, and which he commanded to be keept within the Ark, is, *thou ſhalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vaine*, and with this ſevere Certificat, *that he will not hold them guiltleſſe* who thus profane his name. He threatens to be a ſwift witneſſe againſt the *falſe ſwearer*. [Thou ſhalt performe to the Lord thy oaths,] is amongſt the grand and morall precepts frequentlie inculcat in Scripture. See levit: 6. 3. 19. 12. Numb. 30. 2. Pſal. 15. 4. In this egagement the debt accrews to God, and the abſolution conſequentlie muſt have his ſpeciall warrand. *Quia religio juramenti pertinet ad forum divinum.* Hence the Scripture is full of Inſtances of the Lords dreadfull puniſhing the ſin of perjurie, witneſſe that of Saul and Zedekiah whereof afterward. Now in both theſe engadgements, there is expreſſe mention made *of Swearing by, and unto God.* 2. Theſe engadgements are *promiſes* or *promiſory oaths*, wherein we expreſs our purpoſe, and reſolution, as to

important duties both to God and man, *invoaking himselfs as a witnes of our sinceritie*: we have opened our mouths to God, and to one another in reference to great and weighty duties, relating to the first and Second Table. O what strong bonds are promises, especially of this nature; what conscience did even heathens make of them, whereof instances are abundantly adduced in the Apologie (pag: 334, 335. &c.) 3: These engadgements are *vowes unto God*, that is *promises made to God in the things of God*, such as publick and personall reformation: God here is not only *invoked as a witnes*, but is the *proper Correlat and partie* in this engagement, and O but it is a fearfull thing to fall into his hands, to be punished for the breach hereof. The Scripture is full as to commands and precedents to pay and performe our vowes, see Numb: 30:2. 1. Sam: 1, 21. Ps. 76, 11. Ecc: 5, 4. 5. 4. They are *Covenants*, and that *both with God and man*, viz: *engadgements to God for performance of duties revealed in his word*, such as the people made, when upon the lawes promulgation, they said, whatsoever the Lord commands we will doe, Exod. 19. 8. cap. 24: 3, 7. Deut. 5, 27. and 26, 17. and therefore are so often charged with *breach of Covenant* in their after disobedience. We have engadged to God (in these vowes) speaking to us in his word from heaven, touching nationall and personall reformation. Here is also a mutuall stipulation betwixt the nations, and with one another touching important duties of the 2d. table in relation to there mutuall rights. Now, the Scripture is full in pointing out the weight and importance of such engadgements, see Ezek: 17. Jos. 9: 18, 19. Neh: 9: 38. Jer: 34: 18. So that in these Sacred bonds there is the tye of an *oath*, from the *reverence we owe to God*, whose name we must not take in vain. The obligation of a *vow*, from the *homage*

*and*

*and fealty we owe unto him*, the strength of *a promise*, both to God and man, from *the influence of truth and righteousnesse*, all concurring to render the same Sacred and inviolable.

The binding force of these engadgements does further appear in *their qualities*, as 1. they were *solemnly taken on*: Its a Maxime that *the obligation grows with the solemnity of ane engadgement*; and the Scripture aggregeth the breach from the solemnity, such as the *cutting the calfe in twain*, and Zedekiahs *giving of the hand* &c. For this imports deliberation and resolution in the engadgers, and renders the breach more scandalous and infamous. These oaths were taken by solemn assemblies, and Parliaments, after conference, prayer, fasting &c. 2. These are *holy and most weightie* engagements in the great concerns of Gods glory and our own salvation, the crown and kingdome of Christ against Anti-christ. 3. They are *large* and *extensive*, including duties of the whole word of God, all duties we are tyed to in his holy law. 4. They are *universall* engadgements, all were given up to God in them, representatives and members of Church and state. 5. *perpetuall* and *reall*, as that betwixt David and Ionathan 2. Sam: 9: 7: 21: 7. That betwixt Ioshua and the Gibeonites, Ioshua 9: 18, 19. And that Covenant Dent: 29: 14, 15.

Secondly the binding force of these engadgements appears in the *subject they affect*, as first, our Church in her representatives, and in their most publick capacity, the solemne assemblies in both nations. 2. State representatives & Parliaments, thus all assurances are given, that either civil or Ecclesiastick lawes can affoord, and the publick faith of Church & state is plighted with inviolable tyes: So that they must stand while we have a Church or state, in Scotland; both as men and as Christians, as mmbers of Church & State, under either a religious

religious or civill conſideration, we ſtand hereby inviolably engadged: and not only repreſentatives but the incorporation of Church and State are under the ſame.

*Thirdly* their binding force appears in the *matter* and *Object*, 1. The *immediat formall object* is the Word of God & the Truths and duties therein contained, and whatever is contrary to ſound doctrine, and the power of Godlineſſe, under that *formalis ratio*, is here abjured, the eternall Truth of the Goſpell as holden out in the Word, and received in this and reformed Kirks being the grand rule in this engadgement, whatſoever is approved by it, is embraced, and what is condemned by it, is rejected under that notion. 2. The *more remote or materiall Object*, are the publick, neceſſary, great and important Truths and duties therein enumerat, both of the 1 and 2 Table, and the errours and ſins therein abjured: To the obſervation, faith and obedience of the one, and abhorrencie of the other, under the formentioned conſideration as either conſonant unto, or diſſonant from Gods eternall Word and truth, we ſtand perpetually and inviolably oblidged: So that this Oath hath ane *objective*, as well as *ſubjective* neceſſity contained therein, a neceſſity of the matter in its own nature, prior to the engadgement, as well as a neceſſity of performance flowing from the engadgement it ſelf, which may take place in things indifferent.

*Finaly* the conſtantly obliging *ends* and *ſcope* of theſe engadgments, joyned with the importance of the *matter ſubſervient to theſe ends*, further diſcover their inviolable obligaions. There is here both *neceſſitas precepti*, *neceſſitas medij*, & *finis*. The matter ſworne to be performed, falls under divine precepts, the ſins and evills abjured, falls under divine prohibitions, and theſe engadgements are both in reſpect of the matter it ſelf, and as to the profeſſed

ſcope

scope of the swearers and engadgers, levelled at continually obliging ends; such as Gods glory, the advancing of Christs Kingdom, the publick good of Church and State, the preservation and propagation of publick and personall reformation, truth, unity &c. Now both these Oaths and Covenants are professedly entered into as perpetual engadgements, and in order to these great ends for ever to be promoted, as their tenor clearly holds out.

If any say what is all to the speciall obligation for Presbyterian Government, and in opposition to Prelacie? the Oath may be temporary or cassat and made void as to that point, though there be never so great duties otherwayes engadged unto therin. *Ans* This particular engadgement in relation to the maintenance of Presbyterian Government, and in opposition to Prelacie, runs along in the forementioned particulars. 1. It falls under the obligation of the Oath, vow, promise, and Covenant, and under the forementioned qualifications of solemnity, universality, and importance. Again 2. the publick faith of Church and State reaches this most evidently, and is engadged for it. And 3. as Gods great ordinance holden out in his Word, Presbyterian Government falls within the compass of the object of these Oaths, and under that consideration is sworne to be maintained, and Prelacie as contrary therunto is abjured, which contrariety hath been already cleared. Again Presbyterian Government is here engadged unto as subservient to these great ends mentioned, and Prelacie is abjured as hindering the same, as both the Word of God and experience hath convincingly discovered.

## Chap. II.

*The* Informers *arguments againſt the abjuration of Prelacy in the nationall Covenant fully examined. Some reaſons of his againſt an Oath in generall, or this Oaths obligation upon the poſterity, weighed. The Apologeticall narration, and the Aſſembly 1638, vindicated.*

WE come now to examine what this new *abſolver* or pretended *doubt-reſolver*, hath preſented to us againſt the oblidging force of theſe great engadgments. The defence which he hath patcht up out of the *ſurvey of Naphtali*, and that pamphlet called the *ſeaſonable caſe*, conſiſts of 2. parts. 1. He denys that the bond of either the national, or ſolemne league and Covenant, doth ſtrike againſt the preſent Prelacie. 2. Upon ſuppoſall that the ſolemne league and Covenant doth ſtrike againſt it, he denys its obligation. In both points we ſhall examine his grounds and trace his Method. 1 the doubter alledges that *Prelates are abjured in the Covenant, ſo that none may warrantably owne the Miniſtry of ſuch as preach under them, as being perjured.* To this conſequence he repones nothing, but ſeems to admitt it, and therefore we need not ſpeak unto it. Only he quarrells with the antecedent & tells us that *we would act more Chriſtian Like, if we were ſparing in judging another mans ſervants, who ſtand or fall to their own Maſter.* But the judging there forbidden, being a raſh felfiſh judging of others in things indifferent, as meats or drinks, and (as Calvin paraphraſeth the words) *de hominum factis pronunciare extra*

*extra verbum Dei de factis aliorum non licet ſtatuere ſecundum noſtram ipſius eſtimationem, ſed ex verbo Dei.* *That we are not to judge of mens practiſes by our own opinion, but according to the rule of the Word, and not without its limits.* Telling us further, that *Judicium quod a verbo ſumitur, neque humanum eſt neque alienum*, *that it is no human privat judgement which is drawn from the Scriptures*, the impertinent application of this paſſage & premiſed Scripture to our caſe, which is a practicall diſowning of palpable perjury, and turning away from ſuch, whoſe inſtruction cauſeth to erre from the words of knowledge, is obviously evident. This is no judging without Gods word, but according to it, to ſay that perjury is perjury, ſin is ſin. Our *Informer* by this new knack would take away all chriſtian judgement of diſcretion, yea by this his wide gloſſe, all judiciall decisions whither civill or eccleſiaſtik. Beſides, is not his pamphlet a judging of another mans ſervants, Miniſters and people, as ſchiſmaticks and what not, for diſowning Curats upon the forementioned grounds. Doth he not and all his party judge, deſpiſe, and perſecute the people God, for that which he calls *indifferent*, and a *diſputable point*, at the foot of the page. But to proceed, his Doubter alledging [that all ſtand bound againſt Biſhops in the Covenants which doe abjure them] he cryes out at, *all Bound!* as a paradox, and tells us *that many Miniſters and people never took it, and asks if we think them bound.* Yes we think them bound as we do judge them bound in Gods covenant (Deut: 29.) *who were not there, as well as theſe who were there, young and eld, wives, little ones, from the hewer of wood, to the drawer of water.* It ſeems this man either hath not read that chapt: or underſtands not the import of nationall compacts even among nations themſelves, which do certainlie oblidge all members in the incorporation, although not perſonally ſworne by every indivi-

## Chap. II.

*The* Informers *arguments againſt the abjuration of Prelacy in the nationall Covenant fully examined. Some reaſons of his againſt an Oath in generall, or this Oaths obligation upon the poſterity, weighed. The Apologeticall narration, and the Aſſembly 1638, vindicated.*

WE come now to examine what this new *abſolver* or pretended *doubt-reſolver*, hath preſented to us againſt the oblidging force of theſe great engadgments. The defence which he hath patcht up out of the *ſurvey of Naphtali*, and that pamphlet called the *ſeaſonable caſe*, conſiſts of 2. parts. 1. He denys that the bond of either the national, or ſolemne league and Covenant, doth ſtrike againſt the preſent Prelacie. 2. Upon ſuppoſall that the ſolemne league and Covenant doth ſtrike againſt it, he denys its obligation. In both points we ſhall examine his grounds and trace his Method. 1 the doubter alledges that *Prelates are abjured in the Covenant, ſo that none may warrantably owne the Miniſtry of ſuch as preach under them, as being perjured.* To this conſequence he repones nothing, but ſeems to admitt it, and therefore we need not ſpeak unto it. Only he quarrells with the antecedent & tells us that *we would act more Chriſtian Like, if we were ſparing in judging another mans ſervants, who ſtand or fall to their own Maſter.* But the judging there forbidden, being a raſh felfiſh judging of others in things indifferent, as meats or drinks, and (as Calvin paraphraſeth the words) *de hominum factis pronunciare extra*

*extra verbum Dei de factis aliorum non licet ſtatuere ſecundum noſtram ipſius eſtimationem, ſed ex verbo Dei. That we are not to judge of mens practiſes by our own opinion, but according to the rule of the Word, and not without its limits.* Telling us *further*, that *Judicium quod a verbo ſumitur, neque humanum eſt neque alienum, that it is no human privat judgement which is drawn from the Scriptures*, the impertinent application of this paſſage & premiſed Scripture to our caſe, which is a practicall diſowning of palpable perjury, and turning away from ſuch, whoſe inſtruction cauſeth to erre from the words of knowledge, is obviously evident. This is no judging without Gods word, but according to it, to ſay that perjury is perjury, ſin is ſin. Our *Informer* by this new knack would take away all chriſtian judgement of diſcretion, yea by this his wide gloſſe, all judiciall decisions whither civill or eccleſiaſtik. Beſides, is not his pamphlet a judging of another mans ſervants, Miniſters and people, as ſchiſmaticks and what not, for diſowning Curats upon the forementioned grounds. Doth he not and all his party judge, deſpiſe, and perſecute the people God, for that which he calls *indifferent*, and a *diſputable point*, at the foot of the page. But to proceed, his Doubter alledging [that all ſtand bound againſt Biſhops in the Covenants which doe abjure them] he cryes out at, *all Bound!* as a paradox, and tells us *that many Miniſters and people never took it, and asks if we think them bound.* Yes we think them bound as we do judge them bound in Gods covenant (Deut: 29.) *who were not there, as well as theſe who were there, young and eld, wives, little ones, from the hewer of wood, to the drawer of water.* It ſeems this man either hath not read that chapt: or underſtands not the import of nationall compacts even among nations themſelves, which do certainlie oblidge all members in the incorporation, although not perſonally ſworne by every

indivi-

individuall. Will he ſay that no ſubject as a born ſubject oweth fealty and alledgeance to his Majeſtie, but ſuch as have perſonally ſworn the oaths of ſupremacie or alledgeance. If ſo, then a man could not be guilty of treaſon, which is certainly a breach of this fealty, unleſſe he had perſonally ſworn, which I know not who will aſſert.

But the doubter alledging *That it obligeth even the poſterity*, he tells us that *this is a ſtrange fancy, Juramentum being with caſuiſts, vinculum perſonale, binding thoſe that took it only, that accordingly the Covenant ſayes, [we every one for ourſelves] and not [for our ſelves and others]*

——— *That the father who was againſt Bishops, his ſwearing ſhould not prelimit his ſons judgement (who is for them) in a diſputable point, or oblidge him to act contrary to his judgment.* *Ans*: 1. That there are covenants and oaths *reall* and *hereditary*, as well as *perſonal*, is evident in ſcripture; and if this man were not more led by fancy then truth he would not deny it, which is not only thus evident, but acknowledged alſo by Caſuiſts. Was not that oath and Covenant, Deut: 29. made with them *who were not there* and *belonging unto* (and by conſequence engadging) *their ſeed for ever.* Deut: 5: 2, 3. Moſes tells the people emphatically that God made the Covenant with them who were then alive, even that Convenant at Horeb, though they were all near dead with whom it was made. Neh 9. 38. all entred into Covenant but only ſome ſealed it. Was not that oath of Joſephs brethren anent the carrying up of his bones from Egypt to Canaan, the oath to the Gibeonites, ſuch as did reach and oblidge their poſteritie? So that oath betwixt David and Jonathan. 2 Sam: 9. 7. Now that the nature of this oath is ſuch, cannot be doubted, it being about matters of perpetuall and everlaſting importance, which no time can alter, evacuat or limit, and having the publick

publick faith of Church and ſtate interpoſed therin, by a vowand Covenant with God and man over and above the oath: And likewiſe being in its nature promiſſory, in relation to duties, midſes and ends *perpetually neceſſary* and *obliging*, it is palpably evident that it is *reall*, and *not perſonall* only. 2. For that expreſſion, *every one for our ſelves*, it is very impertinently here alleadged to exclude the poſterity: for the end and motive of the oath before this is expreſſed to be, *the glory of God, the advancement of Chriſts kingdome, the happineſs of the King and his poſterity, the true publick liberty, ſafety of the kingdomes &c.* wherin every ones private ſtate is included; which of neceſſity includes the poſterity and deſignes the obligation for them.

Next, in the cloſe of the firſt article, the poſterity is expreſly taken in, when the end and deſigne of the matters therin contained is ſaid to be, *that we and our poſterity after us may live in faith and love &c:* And in the cloſe of the 5. article we engadge to endeavour *that the Kingdomes may remaine conjoined in a firme peace and union to all poſterity*: and therefor his negative inference viz: *for our ſelves, and not for our poſterity*, is oppoſit unto the very ſenſe, ſcope, and words of this oath: ſo that this clauſe is cleary referable unto the various capacities, conditions, and relations, wherein, in order to the work of God, the then engadgers ſtood. 3. his notion about *prelimiting the ſon by the fathers engadgement*, is a poore ſhift. For this might be objected againſt any nationall mutuall compact, in matters of a farr lower nature then this. This might have been objected againſt Joſuahs oath to the Gibeonites. Might not the poſterity look upon it as a diſputable point to keep unto them, and might not Zedekiahs poſterity look on it as a diſputable point to keep that oath of his to the king of Babylon?

I won-

I wonder if this man would think it ane unlawfull Covenant and vow to engadge for prelacie as now conſtitute, and oblidge for our ſelves and poſterity, that it ſhall ſtand in this poſture. Sure he will not deny the warrantableneſs of this, ſince he looks upon prelacie as the ancient apoſtolick frame, owned by the primitive Church. But ſhall the ſons judgement who is other wayes minded, be prelimited by the father, or els muſt he act contrary to his judgement? let the *Informer* ſee to this. If he ſay its not a diſputable point to hold the preſent prelacie, and that therefor the ſon is oblidged to informe his judgement and act rationally, the obligation to the dutie carrying in its boſom a prior obligation to know it: ſurely he muſt acknowledge that this is our caſe and anſwer as to the Covenant; and that conſequently his objection is naught, and the horns of his horned argument are crooked, ſo that it puſhes us with neither of them. We might alſo here tell him that *a prelimitation as to practice*, in many things not indiſpenſably neceſſary: will fall under the fathers paternall power over Children', witneſſe that caſe of the Rechabites: And that this will not in every thing inferre *a prelimitation in judgment as to the object ſimpliciter*: Nay who knows not that the great morall precept [honour Thy Father and thy Mother] imports a very extenſive obligation upon Children as ſuch, in order to obedience to parents, and gives unto parents a large, and extenſive authority hereanent. But ſhall the ſon be prelimit in his judgment anent all theſe, or act contrary to it? ſo this objection (in the *Informers* ſenſe, and according to his ſcope) will blurre out a great part of the 5t. Command. But what needs more, the matters here engadged unto, are important truths and dutys, not diſputable points, as he and the reſt of his adiaphoriſt latitudinarian party would

would make them: and therefor we are under perpetuall obligations to owne and mantaine the ſame.

But if this man will abide a quere here, and a litle retortion of his notion further, thinks he it not hard to prelimit the faithfull miniſtery and profeſſors of this nation, in their judgement about his diſputable points of the preſent conformity, by ſo many laws and acts, or elſe oblidge them to act contrary to their judgement? Sure fathers have at leaſt as great, if not a greater authority to limit their children, then the Prelats and their party to prelimit the Presbyterian Miniſters of this Church. Eſpecially (which is our advantage in this compariſon) the children being ſuppoſed under no previous contrary obligations to that which in this caſe the fathers put upon them in relation to prelacie, as the non-conformiſts are under counter obligations to that which is now demanded of them by their perſequutors.

„ Mr Crofton. (in his analepſis, pag. 145.) „ tells „ us that conſidering the Covenant as made by the „ people of England, *as a Kingdom and a Politicall body*, „ *profeſſing the reformed religion*, it looks like a nationall „ obligation, that the confluence of *publick aſſent and* „ *authority* by the people collectively and diſtributi- „ vely conſidered, the acceſſion of Royall aſſent, ma- „ kes it a *Publick and nationall Covenant*, *binding all* „ *perſons of the nation* (that ſware, or ſware not perſo- „ nally) and *our poſterity after us*, in their particular „ places, and *all that ſhall ſucceed unto the publick places*, „ *and Politick capacities of this kingdom*, to preſerve and „ purſue the things therein promiſed, ſo long as it re- „ maines a kingdom, *under one king*, *and in the pro-* „ *feſſion of one reformed religion*. He enforces this with „ the lord chief Barons ſpeech, to the condemned „ traytors at the old baylie [you were bound to beare „ allegance to your king, yea though you may not

have

„ have taken the oath of alleadgance your ſelves, yet „ yow were bound by the Recogintion of king James „ and his poſterity made at his firſt coming to the crown „ of this Realme, by' the whole parliament, being „ the whole collective body of the kindom] hence he „ inferrs, *that they and their poſterity, muſt needs be bound,* „ who themſelves have [univerſaly] by the authority „ of ſuch who were intruſted for them engadged the „ faith of the nation: for I ſee not (ſaith he) how they „ can give away our eſtates or take pardons in the „ name, and to the ſecurity of the nation if they may „ not in our name make oaths, promiſes, and Co- „ venants *to bind us and our Succeeding generations and* „ *poſterities*, in ſenſe whereof I cannot but deſire all „ that wiſh well to England to conſider *the Covenant,* „ *the Solemne League and Covenant.* So that with Mr Crofton it is an uncontrovertible point, that the obligation of this Sacred oath reaches the poſterity, which he makes good from the ſenſe and pleading of the Lord chief Baron in the point of alledgance and fealty to his Majeſty which is the ſentiment of all Lawers, and of the law it ſelf. So that what our *Informer* calls ane *odd fancy*, appears to be a moſt ſolid truth, conſonant both to Scripture, reaſon and the law of nations. As for the next objection of his doubter *anent the fathers obliging for the child in Baptiſm* it is not our argument, nor is *ſutable* to the ſtate of this queſtion, which is concerning a Covenant taken for our ſeed als well as for our ſelves; and if he acknowledge that *the father binds not, in the name and room of the childe*, then it toucheth not our point, for our queſtion is about *fathers taking on engadgements for themſelves and their poſterity.* As for what the *Informer* adds here, its good that he acknowledges *that ane obliging force flows from the binding mater in that baptiſmall Covenant, and that the childs obligation is ſtrengthened by his vow*, which is enough

in

in our caſe againſt him, ſince the matter of our Covenants, and vows fall under divine precepts, to which the obligation of the oaths and vows is acceſſory. So that having ſworne to keep theſe holy engadgements unto God, we muſt performe, and here he contradicts his forleader, the author of the ſeaſonable caſe, who will have us either acknowledge the matter of the Covenant indifferent, or not plead the force of an oath or vow as ſuperadded to that which was duty before.

The doubter next objects *That having ſworne againſt prelacie we muſt not any more diſpute, or queſtion the obligation, citing, Prov:* 20. 25. This objection he advantagiouſly for himſelf, but fooliſhly propones, that he may make way for ſome diſcourſe (forſooth) upon this Scripture. We acknowledge as well as he, that we are not forbidden *to enquire into an oath and vow in what caſes, and how farre it is binding.* Nay this is commanded, ſince we muſt both *ſweare and performe in Judgement*, which requires a knowledge and inquiry as we ſaide before; and when an oath or vow is found *materialy unlawfull, and vinculum Iniquitatis*, it is no tranſgreſſion of this precept to quite it. Such an inquiry as is in order to the underſtanding and performance of this vow in faith, we will allow whither to young or old. Only for what he ſayes *of many who were put to ſweare at ſchools and colledges, and engadge in this Covenant, who could not do it in judgement*, it is a calumnie which he cannot juſtifie, all being exhorted and inſtructed therein who were come to Years of diſcretion, ſo as to be in capacity to enter into this Covenant, with judgement: and if leſſer young ones preſent in congregations where it was ſworne, did ſignifie a ſpontaneous conſent, it was no more, then what Iſraels litle ones did by their preſence before the Lord, Deut: 29. Well, but what is forbidden here

ehre *to make inquiry* (ſaith he) *how the vow may be eluded*. This is ingenuouſlie ſaide, and hereby his own lips condemne him and all his party, who have been now for many years, racking their wits to finde out evaſions how to elude this Sacred vow. Witneſſe the many pamphlets on this Subject ſince his Majeſtie's returne, and this mans among the reſt.

But the Doubter alleading *that upon enquiry we will finde our ſelves bound againſt prelacy both by the nationall & ſolemme League.* He falls upon his impugnation firſt of the nationall Covenant, telling us as touching it [that the terme of *the Popes wicked hiearchy* will not include prelacie, as the *ſurvey of Naphtali* fully proves] well, let us hear theſe proofs. The firſt is *becauſe king James and his counſel (the impoſers of that Covenant, and the takers of it, Anno* 1580) *did in anno* 1581: *ratifie the agreement at Leith, made betwixt the Commiſſioners of the ſtate and Church anno* 1581. *which was in favours of epiſcopacy. And would the king and counſell the next year have acted ſo contrary to it, if they had thought all epiſcopacy to be abjured therin Anſ.* Is this the great demonſtration, which the Survever, and he have drawen out to prove this point, this being nothing but the old muſty ſtore of the Seaſonable caſe, better propounded therein, then its here. To this I ſay, firſt, it is a very weak or rather wilde proof to conclude that ſuch a corruption as prelacie could not be imported in that expreſſion, *Becauſe the takers and impoſers did ſome time after counteract and contradict their engadgement*: muſt the ſenſe of a promiſſory oath and Covenant be meaſured by the after practice of engadgers? Sure he will not darre to admit this rule, and yet its the very topick of his argument. I would but ask him, if we could clearly demonſtrat from the words of this oath, and from this

this expreſſion, that epiſcopacy is therein abjured, muſt he not grant that this argument taken from their after practice who took it, will ſignifie nothing, ſince it cannot ſtand good againſt the ſenſe of the words, and the obligation natively reſulting therefrom. Sure he cannot deny this, elſe he will ſwallow monſtrous abſurdities. And therefor unleſſe he can diſprove our arguments, which do prove prelacie to be abjured in that oath, and by the words in their genuine ſenſe, he muſt grant that this *practicall argument* will ſignifie nothing. 2. He might have found that the Apologiſt outſhoots the Surveyer and him, as alſo the Seaſonable caſe in their own bow, and breaks this argument with a wedge of their own ſetting: for whereas they alledge that about a year or leſſe after this Covenant was impoſed and taken, King James ratified that aggreement at Leith. He retorts that at the aſſembly 1581. *which had declared prelacie utterly Unlawfull, and without warrand in the word*, the Kings Commiſſioner preſented to them (together with the Covenant ſubſcribed by the King) a plot of presbyterys to be erected by him through the Kingdom, together with his letter to noblemen and gentlemen to be aſſiſtant therein, and for diſſolving prelacies, to make way for theſe judicatories made up of Miniſters and Elders. Hence (Saith he) how could King James intend prelacy by this confeſſion ſince the ſelf ſame day (a ſhorter time then half a year) wherein this confeſſion (ſubſcribed by him and his houſhold) was preſented to be ſubſcribed by the aſſembly, he preſented a plot of presbyteries to be erected through the Kingdom. Now let our Abſolvers *Medium* come in here, would King and counſell have acted ſo much for presbytery, and in oppoſition to Prelacie, in that very day wherein this nationall Covenant was preſented by him, If he had not judged

prelacie to be therein abjured, and presbyterie engaged unto. And (if this assemblies carriage will have any weight in this argument) would they have recorded this oath as the Test and badge of this their nationall engagement, after they had immediatly before judicially declared against prelacie, if they had not looked upon it as abjured therin, and understood this oath in a sense opposit thereunto.

The *Informers* next reason is, *that in their strivings with the King to get prelacie away, they never used this argument, that it was abjured in the nationall Covenant, which they would have done, had they thought it to be included in that expression, of [the Popes Hierarchie.]* This, our Informer hath very justly copied out of the Seasonable case. What? had the Surveyer in all these pages which he cites, no new notions to furnish him with, that this proctor is still feeding on the old store. But to the matter, first, how (I pray) runs this argument, [Ministers pleaded not this obligation at that time with King James: Ergo, There was no such meaning in the nationall Covenant] surely this is a wide consequence. 2. this is yet wider [we know not of any such pleading at that time: ergo there was none] besides, he might have found that the Apologist tells him out of Petries hist: pag. 448. That Mr. Melvin in anno 1584. writing to divines abroad anent our Church, shews them *that three years since, the discipline of this Church was approved, sealed, and confirmed with profession of faith, subscription of hand, and religion of oath, by the King and every subject of every state particularly.* And that (pag. 570.) he shews that when some Ministers (anno 1604) were accused by the Synod of Lothian as to *a designe of overturning the government*, the synod presented *the confession of faith* to them, as containing ane abjuration of prelacie, and a vow for presbyterian govern-

government, And that *Mr. Forbes* one of the impannelled Miniſters for holding that meeting at Aberdeen in anno 1605. in his diſcourſe to the gentlemen of the aſſize, ſhewed *that they were bound by the nationall Covenant to mantaine the diſcipline of the Church*, and having read it to them, he told them *that they would be guilty of perjury. if for feare or flattery they diſcernd that to be treaſon which themſelves had ſworne and ſubſcribed.* Who alſo deſired the Earle of Dunbar to ſhew the King *what followed upon the breach of the oath to the Gibeonites, and that they feared the like ſhould fall on him and his poſterity.* The Seaſonable caſe (pag: 13.) acknowledges that Miniſters at that time lookt upon themſelves as obliged againſt prelacy, by the national Covenant, as well as we by the League, in plaine contradiction to this *Informer.* As for that which he adds [of Beza's intention in writing againſt prelacie] we ſpoke to it already upon the firſt dialogue. And ſeeing this man objects to us Beza here again, we will offer to his conſideration, Beza his 79. epiſtle written to John Knox, and dated at Geneva, Aprile 12. 1562. Wherein he ſayes, „ This is the bleſſing of God that ye „ brought into Scotland, together with the ſownd „ doctrine, ευταξιαν or good diſcipline —— he „ obteſts him to keep theſe two, ſince if the one be „ loſt, the other cannot long continue —— there- „ after he imputes it to this cauſe, viz the want of „ this pure diſcipline, that the goſpell is preached „ to many in judgement, not in Mercy. Then he „ adds, I *would have thee (my Knox) and the reſt of the „ brethren remember (which is now as befor our eyes) that as „ the Biſhops brought in the papacie, ſo theſe falſe Biſhops „ the relicts of papacie, will bring Epicuriſme into the Church.* „ *Let them beware of this whoever wish the ſafety of the „ Church: and ſeeing ye have once baniſhed is out of Scot- „ land, receive it never again, albeit it doth flatter with the*

*shew of retaining unity, whereby many of the beſt ancients were deceived.* See Petries hiſt. part. 3. pag. 376.

The Doubter next enquiring what is meant by the *Popes hierarchie.* He anſwers, *not all Biſhops, but theſe who actually depended upon the Pope, and that all Biſhops can no more be underſtood, then reformed Presbyters, who renounce their dependance upon him; Presbyters and Deacons being a part of his hierarchie, as the Council of Trent determines. Anſ.* This is already removed when we did ſhew that prelacy is here abjured *ſimpliciter,* and abſoluty, abſtracting from this dependance, it being here abjured as other corruptions are abjured, not mainly or only, becauſe the Pope brought them in (as the aſſembly at Glaſgow in the year 1638 clears it in their explanatory act, and likewiſe the Apollogiſt pag. 396.) but as a corruption, *ex ſe & ſua natura* of its own nature, contrary to the word of God, and the pure received doctrine of this Church. It is *His wicked hierarchie* as the reſt of the corruptious therein enumerat, are called [*his*] ſuch as invocation of Saints, dedications of altars &c. Becauſe introduced by him, not to diſtinguiſh theſe corruptions, from a lawfull dedication of altars, worſhipping of Images &c. Doth this man think that theſe Reformers would have admitted ſuch corruptions preſented under another notion then the Popes authority, and obtruded by this Argument; *that their dependance upon him being broken off, they were no more to be accounted his corruptions?* ] or that they would have embraced extreme unction, or ſome other of his Sacraments, and the inferiour orders of Lectors, Acoluthi, Exorciſts &c: upon ſome other conſideration then his Sacraments or orders? ſurely he dare not aſſert this, and ſo the caſe is here. 2. As for his reaſon *that otherwiſe all Miniſters and Deacons ſhould be abjured.* It is very impertinent, Becauſe: 1. Miniſters and Deacons, are *officers*

*of divine appointment*, ſo that the abuſe being removed, this divine officer ſtands; but prelacie is, *exſe*, or of it ſelf, contrary to the word of God, as we have proved. 2. The Hierarchie is abjured in that Covenant, as contrary to *the then diſcipline of this Church*, but ſo are not Presbyters and Deacons. 3. We have proved that the Hierarchie, and the ſpeciall prerogatives which prelates arrogate to themſelves, ar originaly papal, and they in a ſpeciall manner are looked upon by him as his creatures. 4. as the Papacy cannot ſubſiſt without prelacie, and any otherwayes then upon its ſhoulders, ſo neither prelacie nor the Papacy can conſiſt with Presbyterian government, and Presbyters divine right and power.

The Doubter next objects [that all Biſhops depend on the Pope, citing Appol: pag. 395. And that therefor all Epiſcopacy is abjured in this oath.] He anſwers, *the Apologie ſayes they depend upon the Pope, in eſſe & operari, but asks how he proves it, and tells us that to ſay it is ſo becauſe the Pope acknowledges they depend upon him alone, is a poor becauſe, evident to any ordinary capacity, reſolving this upon the Popes* [*ipſe dixit*] *like a Papiſt, and gives the Papiſts that advantage over Proteſtant Churches, that a Biſhop depends upon the Popes ſupremacie, now and from the beginning, wherein he ſaith, proteſtants do oppoſe the Pope and prove that his ſupremacy was contradicted by Councils and Fathers. Anſ:* The ſilly Impertinency of this new agent of the tottering cauſe, is here very evident, in thus reflecting upon that Author, whoſe anſwers to theſe poor arguments of the Seaſonable caſe, he dare not touch. For that Pamphleter alleging [that Prelates are not abjured in that Covenant, but as they depend on the Pope, as it abjures the five baſtard Sacraments, as he makes them Sacraments, and that therefor the corruptions only of theſe offices which flow from him, are abju-

red, and as a part of his blaſphemous prieſthood.] The Apologiſt taking this confeſſion, inferrs there-„ upon. „ That if theſe offices be abjured as a part of „ his Hierarchie, and as confirmed by, and depending upon him, then Prelates are abjured, who depend „ upon him *in eſſe & operari.* The Prelate as ſuch „ being no officer of divine appointment, as the Prieſ-„ byter and deacon, which if they were, then this „ Caſuiſts argument would hold good, that we were „ to remove the corruption, and retain the inſtitution „ and ordinance of God. But ſince we do ſuppoſe „ the office itſelf to be a corruption, and he hath not „ proved the contrary, his paralled as to the baſtard „ Sacraments is naught. And to clear this matter of fact that they are a part of the Popes hierarchie, by the Popes acknowledgement, that Author cites *Peter-Suave* in his hiſtory of the council of Trent, where the Pope would not have it determined, whither Prelats were *Juris Divini*, leſt they ſhould not depend upon him after this as formerlie. Now the queſtion here being, *whether the Pope lookt upon Prelates as a part of his hierarchie, as in the capacity of Prelates*: in order to the clearing of this other queſtion depending betwixt this reverend author, and the Author of the Seaſenable caſe, viz. *whither our Reformers intended to abjure Prelats in that Covenant, as a part of the Popes hierarchie.* To clear this matter of fact, what could be mote pertinent then the Popes own acknowledgement, and judiciall declarator; that *de facto* they depend upon him, and are owned as parts of his hierarchie, is in this convincingly apparent. That *de jure* they have no divine warrand, this author ſuppoſed it as his principle, the contrary wherof neither that Pamphleter, nor any other hath proved: So that the Popes [ipſe dixit] in this, is ſufficient to prove this matter of fact. That he made not the Po-

pes,

pes, [ipſe dixit] the rule to decide whither this officer be *juris divini*, or not, is in this convincingly evident (and by conſequence this mans obvious folly in imputing to him ſuch ane aſſertion) that he grants, that if this Caſuiſt had proved the Prelate to be *juris divini*, and inſtitute by Chriſt or his Apoſtles, then the abjuring [of the Popes wicked Hierarchie], would import only the abjuring of [the corruption of this officer], whoſe lawfull office might be ſtill retained: but this caſuiſt taking this for granted that he is ſo inſtitute, and reaſoning upon that ſuppoſition, the author had good ground, until his Antagoniſt as the affirmer ſhouldpro vehis ſuppoſition, to hold faſt his own principle viz, that *the prelats Epiſcopal being is papal*: which is cleared by many of the Learned from convincing Teſtimonies. Let this Reſolver read Leo (epiſt.86.) and Swave (Tom. 4. pag. 465. of the Council of Trent, ſeſſ. 23. cap. 4. *de Sacram. ordinis*) where *Anathema* is pronounced upon any that denyes Prelates power of ordination. &c. over Presbyters. I ſuppoſe he were alleging againſt a Papiſt that ſome of the Popiſh orders are eſſential pieces of his hierarchie, and ſhould prove it by the Popes acknowledgment and conſtitutions, would he think the Papiſts rejoynder good, *ergo, ye owne the Popes authority, and make his*, [*ipſe dixit*] *judge*. Say it were a queſtion anent the Acoluthi or *Exorciſts* &c. Whither they are a part of the Popes Hierarchie? would he not think the Popes acknowledgment and owning them for ſuch, to be a ſufficient argument to prove this? ſince he ſuppoſeth (and rationally) that they have no other right either *in eſſe*, or *operâri*. Do not all our divines draw Arguments from the Pope and his councils acknowledgment, to prove their owning of many corruptions, and that they are properly theirs. But do they juſtifie the Popes

[*Ipse dixit*] in proving this, or in this method of arguing? since they do suppose *aliunde*, that they have no divine right, as the Apologist in the point of prelacie rationally doth. 2. as for what he adds of *protestant Churches, or Prelates, their opposing the Popes pretended right and Supremacy hereanent*, we say that they impugne his supremacy best, who lay an axe to its root [prelacie]. And to grant that prelacy is of its self a part of his Hierarchie, will no more justify his supremacy, then Pauls saying that the mysterie of iniquity was working in his time would do it. And al tho the first Proestotes or Bishops did not formally depend upon him, yet as a humane device they made way for him, and *eatenus*, are a part of his Hierarchie, which the opposition of some Bishops when he first attempted supremacy doth nothing invalidat. Besides that the question here betwixt the Apologist and that Pamphleter, was about prelacie as it appeared befor the Reformers *in its then being and would*, but not of the first proestotes or moderatours. What he adds here anent Calvin [his owning of a hierarchie, and pronouncing Anathema upon them who would disowne it, if cut off from its dependance upon the Pope] is answered already upon the 1. Dialogue. Here I shall only adde, that if Calvin in that passage, opposed unto the [Popish Bishops] *Such as take Christ for their head*, what curse will he not judge them worthy of, who owne and plead for such Bishops as pretending to renounce the Popes headship, take for their immediat head a *civill Pope*, and make him as to all spirituall maters, a more absolute head then the Pope himself.

As for his argument from these Ministers who reasoned with the Doctors of Aberdeen [their declaring that the Doctors might take the Nationall Covenant, and yet debate and vote in relation to episcopacie in the

the enſuing aſſembly] I wonder what blurred this mans eyes, that citing pag. 395. of the Apollogy, he could not look back, to pag. 393. where he might have found this argument of his Maſter the author of the Seaſonable caſe anſwered, which this caſuiſt drew from that pamphlet emitted anno 1638. under the name of his Majeſties Commiſſioner; ſo that we have it here in the 3d concoction, and yet it is as raw as at the firſt. The anſwer in ſhort is (I remit it at length to his reading in that peice) that it was not the nationall Covenant it ſelf that the Doctors ſcrupled to ſubſcribe, and conſequently anent which that debate was ſtated betwixt the Miniſters and them, but the addition containing, the application to the preſent times, which as to prelacie was expreſſed thus [a forbearing the approbation of the corruptions of the publick government of the Church] by this they *thought* they were expreſly ſpecifically bound againſt prelacie: this theſe Miniſters denyed, but never ſaid that prelacie was not abjured in the nationall Covenant it *ſelf*, or the negative Confeſſion. Let this Abſolver read the anſwers of the Miniſters, wherein this will be cleared.

The Doubter next objects [that the deciſion of the aſſembly 1638. put it out of doubt that prelacie was abjured in that Covenant, and that all Epiſcopacy was meant by the Popes hierarchie]. To which he anſwers. 1. *That prelacie being of divine, or Apoſtolick right, that deciſion is null from the beginning.* *Anſ.* wheras he ſayes he hath proved prelacie to be of divine or apoſtolik right, I will preſume to ſay I have proved the contrary; ſo that the Covenant is ſo far from being null upon this ground, that it is rather an acceſſorie tye to diſown a corruption, to the diſowning wherof, wewere before by ſcripture grounds preoblidged. But paſſing this, he next alledges *that it was more then that aſſembly could*

*do to declare this.* Who ſo? 1. (ſayth he) *how could they put a ſenſe upon ane oath taken 58. years before, and few or none of the firſt takers alive. or if alive, few or none members of that aſſemblie? how could they know that their expoſition was according to the mind of the firſt impoſers?* But why will this Plageary tell us ſtill over and over the arguments of the Seaſonable caſe, without noticing the anſwer therof already exhibit unto him? did not the Apologiſt tell him, that this reaſon ſuppoſeth the ſenſe of that Covenant to periſh with the firſt framers. And whereas that caſuiſt added, to make the argument ſtronger (which this his diſciple forgot) that the oath being *vinculum perſonale*, they could not give the ſenſe of dead men. To this the Apologiſt anſwers, „ that there is alſo a *vinculum* „ *reale*, as this nationall oath was. and that it oblid-„ ging all the Land, and the poſterity, we were accor-„ dingly in order to performance, bound to Search „ into its meaning, and that this was the proper work „ & duty of a general aſſembly. That that caſuiſt him-„ ſelf acknowledged (which this borrower ſhould have „ noticed) that this was the judgement of Miniſters „ concerning its ſenſe when prelates were firſt obtrud-„ ed upon this Church, ſo that its true meaning from „ hand to hand was come to them, and that they were „ the more *in tuto* to judge of it. And whereas the argument of the Seaſonable caſe had a Limitation in it which this man forgott, viz: [unleſs that aſſembly could produce authentick evidences that this was the meaning of Impoſers] the Apologiſt told him that they did produce authentick expreſſe evidences, that ſuch was the meaning of the firſt takers. I would know how this man comes to deſcant upon the ſenſe of ancient writers in this pamphlet, and to determine anent ſentences of private writers, dead ſeverall centuries of years agoe? He is very confident in faſt-

faſtning his Gloſſes upon Jerom's words. I trowe that Author is dead more then 58. years agoe. And for as clear as his words are againſt the divine right of prelacie, yet this man thinks he is Cock ſure that this was not the meaning of Jerom's words, which presbyterians alledge. *Quis talia fando, temperet a riſu.*

But the Seaſonable caſe goes on to object next (and this reſolver followes up at his heels.) *That all which that Aſſembly produceth (Seſſ. 16.) to prove this to be the meaning of that Oath, amounts only to this, that the Church about that time of taking the Covenant, and alſo afterward, was labouring againſt Bishops, but proves not that epiſcopacie was abjured in the words of the oath.* Now why would he not do his Doubter ſuch a ſmall piece of juſtice, as to put into his mouth the large anſwer of the Apologiſt to this argument, from (pag. 406. to 409.) But this would have made him too ſtiffe a Doubter for this Reſolver or Informer: but had he nothing in the *Surveyer* to reſolve this? Well, the Apologiſt here tells him and his Leaders in this argument, „ that the „ Covenant ſuppoſeth a Government then in being, „ to the defence of which it oblidgeth: that that Go- „ vernment was not prelacie, but presbytery, he clears „ by a large induction of our aſſemblies acts and pro- „ cedour, as the Aſſembly 1638. did before; ſo that, „ that matter of fact being clear, there is No doubt „ but that the nationall Covenant binds to defend and „ preſerve presbyterian Government then owned and „ exiſting; even as its engadgement to defend the „ King muſt needs be underſtood of King James who „ was then reigning. That this was the government then Exiſtent and owned by this Church, we cleared in ſhort already, and need not here repeat it. But 3. this *Informer* (paſſing over a more plauſible objection of his Maſter the Seaſonable caſe) enquires *by what*

*what warrand that aſſembly could put upon others their ſenſe of the Covenant; they might declare their own ſenſe* (ſaith he) *which poſſibly was not right, but how could they oblidge others to their ſenſe, who had taken it before, the firſt impoſers having given them no ſuch power.* The Apologiſt here told him, that this aſſembly put no ſenſe of their own upon any who took it either before or after, but as the repreſentatives of this Church gave a judiciall interpretation of it, and by authentick evidences made it appear, that this was the ſenſe of the impoſers, and of the Church of Scotland when it was taken, and that ſuch as ſware it before with an explicatory addition [to forbear the approbation of prelacie, untill the aſſembly ſhould try whither it was abjured in that oath] did conſequently commit this unto, and were accordingly depending upon the aſſembly to declare the meaning therof; beſides that the judicial interpretation of this nationall Church her oath, did of right belong unto this her ſupreme judicatory as is ſaid. Here the Doubter objects [that thoſe who took the Covenant after it was thus ſenſed by the aſſembly, have abjured Epiſcopacy]. To this he anſwers *that the aſſembly did intend to put no other ſenſe upon it, then the ſenſe of the words, and of the firſt impoſers.* Very true, but what then? *the firſt impoſers having no ſuch meaning* (ſayth he) *as to abjure Epiſcopacie, the aſſemblies ground failes, and their poſterior meaning could not bind againſt the firſt meaning.* This laſt is eaſily granted, but the great pinch lyes in this, how proves he *that the firſt Impoſers never meaned it againſt Epiſcopacie.* This he ſayes is already ſhewed, but where? we muſt waite it ſeems for a new pamphlet to get an account of this great proofe.

The Doubter next alleadeth to purpoſe [that we engadge our ſelves in that Covenant to adhere to this Church in doctrine, faith, religion and diſcipline, and

—— and to continue in the doctrine and diſciplin thereof, which is Presbyterian diſcipline.] To this he anſwers. *That by diſcipline, cannot be meant Presbyterian government.* Why ſo? *becauſe* (ſaith he) *at the firſt impoſing of the Covenant there was no ſuch government in Scotland nor for a conſiderable time after.* *Anſ.* we have made it appear that Epiſcopacie was judicially declared unlawfull, and that both the books of diſcipline were received, which overthrow prelacie, and aſſerts Presbyterian diſcipline, before ever that Covenant was taken; and that at the very time of taking it the old mould of prelacies were diſſolved, and Presbyteries erected both by the King, and aſſembly. But how proves our *Informer* that there was no ſuch government in Scotland at that time? *becauſe* (ſaith he) *the King, for all Miniſters eſſayes to introduce Presbytery, yet owned Epiſcopacy.* But how proves he this, that at the impoſing of the Covenant, he owned epiſcopacy? did he not owne the aſſemblies power, and the power of Synods? preſented he not to that aſſembly 1581, a plot of Presbytries, and his letter enjoyning their erection, & to diſſolve prelacies, together with the ſubſcribed Covenant? how did this owne epiſcopacy? let Royaliſts take notice what an ingrained diſſembler this man makes King James, in ſaying that he ſtill owned epiſcopacy, when ſo palpably diſowning it to the ſenſe of all reaſonable men. And if king James came all this length as to the introducing of Presbytrie, ſurely Miniſters eſſayes with him for this end, were very effectuall. Beſides, its a poor argument to prove that this proteſtant organick Church was not at that time owning Presbyterian goverment, or exerciſing it (and by conſequence that the Diſcipline as then exiſtent, ſworne to be mantained in that oath, is not Presbyterian) to ſay that king James owned epiſcopacie. Nay, in granting theſe eſſayes of Miniſters

niſters for Presbytry, he grants *that Presbyterian government was owned.* For ſure I am what was their ſenſe and endeavours as to Presbyterian government from the beginning, the ſame were the ſenſe and endeavours of the body of this proteſtant Church. But his 2d anſwer to the premiſed objection of his Doubter is uſhered in with a *therefor*——— what next? *therefor the government meant in it muſt be Epiſcopacie, if any particular mode of government be underſtood.* This is well ſtept out, a piece beyond his Maſter the Seaſonable caſe, who hardly comes this length. The man that will let us Epiſcopacie in this Church at that time, as the Government imbraced by her, muſt have odd proſpectives, and of a like quality with theſe of our *Informer*, which have deſcryed Dioceſian Biſhops in Scripture. We heard that the Seaſonable caſe grants [that Miniſters then lookt on themſelves as oblidged againſt epiſcopacie, both by the nationall Covenant, and by the word of God] pray Sir, be tender of theſe Miniſters reputation, were they ſo principled and ſtill owning epiſcopacie too? this is ſtrange, yea and owning it and promiſing to defend it in this Covenant. Beſides, how will he reconcil our Churches *labouring now againſt Biſhops*, acknowledged by him pag. 118. with her *practiſing Epiſcopacy*, which he aſſerts pag. 118. But his anſwer hath a proviſo [if any particular mode of government was underſtood.] But why will this latetudinarian *Informer* caſt the miſt of a heſitating [if] upon a clear and plaine truth? ſtrange! Speaks not the Covenant of an exiſtent frame of Government embraced by this Church? What! Were they embracing *a Proteus*? was it an exiſtent *individuum vagum*, *or materia prima*, ſome Embryon that had received yet no forme? But how proves he that Prelacie was ſworne unto in that Oath? *Becauſe* (ſaith he) *the Year after, the King ratified the agreement at Leith in favours of Epiſcopacie.* This we heard before, and did ſhew what an inſignificant reaſon it is, from King James

mes practice a year after, to inferre what is the ſenſe and intendment of this Oath, and the takers of it. A topick and reaſon which none who are ſolid and rationall will admitt. Yet the *Informer* ſtill beats upon this Anvill. Beſides, the Apologiſt tells him (pag. 15.) that this treaty at Leith, anno 1571, *was oppoſed and cenſured by the Nationall Aſſembly, the very next year*; So that this national Church in her ſuprem judicatory, gave no conſent unto, but oppoſed that treaty, and whatever receſſes from her Presbyterial Government, were therin begun; But this mans ſqeemiſh eyes, ſtil overlooks what he cannot anſwer. Now remark our *Informers* profound and ſubtill reaſoning in this point. King James did not abjure epiſcopacy in the Nationall Covenant, why ſo? Becauſe the next Year he acted for Epiſcopacie. And when we allege that the Government to which that Covenant oblidgeth, was Presbyterian Government which was then exiſtent; he tells us that the Government then exiſtent was epiſcopall. And when he is put to the proofe of this paradox againſt ſuch clear evidences, he juſt recurrs again and tells us (for his proof) that King James then acted for epiſcopacie; fine circular reaſoning this is, and the *Informer* ſhall thus never want a *Medium*, & knows exactly to anſwer the ſolideſt argument againſt-him with turning, according to the Souldiers dialect, *asye were.*

But what is meant by [diſcipline] in that Covenant? *The ſubſtantialls of it* (ſayth he) *and neceſſary policie as expreſt in the firſt book of diſcipline, 9. Cap. which is unalterable, tho particular formes (as ſome think) may be changed.* But 1. Why will this verſatil *Informer* bemiſt his reader what dark and generall expreſſions. Whither means he the [*eſſential neceſſary Policy,*] *according to that phraſe of the book*, or a neceſſary Policy *expreſt and aſſerted in that book*? If the firſt, I would ask him. 1. Why condeſcends he not upon that eſſential and

ne

*neceſſary policy*, and gives no account of its nature and extent, as it is contradiſtinguiſhed from that which is *not neceſſary*, but *mutable*. 2. If by *ſubſtantials of Government*, he mean all Church-officers of divine appointment, according to the Scripture account of their qualifications, their authority, and its due exercise, with what ſenſe or reaſon can he ſuppoſe, or any els, that this wil not determin *a particular form*, & can ſubſiſt without it? how can *a particular form* be more formaly and explicitly deſcribed then thus? But, next, if by *neceſſary Policy*, he underſtand *the Policy held out and aſſerted in that firſt book*, I would ask him. 1. Why excludes he the *ſecond book*, which was at this time extant and received, and which doth in ſeverall chapters viz. 5, 6, 7, 8. treat of the Paſtor, Doctor, Elder, and Deacons office, which he will no doupt own as *ſubſtantiall peeces of Church-policy*, being ſo clearly aſſerted in Scripture. 2. Why anſwers he not to the account & character of that firſt book given by the Apoll: (pag. 10.) who tells him *that it overthrowes prelacy in the eſtabliſhing of Church-ſeſſions, the way of election and triall of Miniſters, and ſeverall other things contrary to the epiſcopall method*; will he by this ſilence conſent, that prelacy ſtands in oppoſition to *the ſubſtantialls of Church Government*, and the *utterly neceſſary Policy* [therof] to a policy *indeed unalterable*; (to uſe his time phraſe)? if he ſay, that he underſtands by this phraſe, that policy which is neceſſary in either or both theſe books, but not the intir. Policy delineated therin; how will he prove that the Covenant-obligation in the Intention of the impoſers, reaches the on and not the other? Next I would ask this *Informer*, whither thinks he that *particular forms* of Government are *alterable*, yea or not? if not, how comes he to diſtinguiſh them in this, from the eſſentiall neceſſary Policy which he cals *unalterable*? if he think them alterable, why doth he not poſitively aſ-

ſert

ſert this, but preſents this opinion as *the thoughts of ſome only*, and cenſurs Stillingfleets opinion herin (pag. 76.) Beſides, if by [ſubſtantials of Government] he unſtand [the diſciplin aſſerted in that book,] he juſtles and deals ſtroaks what his reverend father B. Spotswood, in his character therof exhibit in his Hiſtory, pag. 174. For firſt, he ſayes *it was framed in imitation of the Government of the reformed Church* in *Geneva*, which all know was Presbyterian. 2dly. He ſayes *it it could not take effect as being but a Dream.* And did he call the [ſubſtantialls of Government] but a Dream, thinks this man? Surely either the Biſhop or our *Informer* dreams. 3dly. *He wisheth John Knox had retained the old policy*, and therefore in his ſenſe this policy was diſtinct from Prelacie. On the other hand the framers (the Miniſtry owneing it) ſupplicat the Parliament after it was drawn up for [the reſtauration of the Diſcipline of the ancient Church,] and for diſcharging the Popes uſurpation, and of all that Diſcipline that did flow therefrom, as inconſiſtent with the Diſcipline of the ancient Church, and the Diſciplin contained in that book. How abſurd is it to ſuppoſe that it was only *ſubſtantialls* which was at this time exiſtent, and no *particular forme*; it being a forme of Government and the Diſcipline of this Church, which the Covenant oblidges unto; and the Apologiſt as, well as the Aſſembly 1638. could have given him a large account and proof of a particular forme at this time exiſtent. In a Word, let us have all the ſubſtantialls of Government, i. e. All Church officers divinely appointed, with their due power and Aſſemblies higher and lower, and it will quickly juſtle his prelacie to the door, and make him him and his Fathers feeſt he dint of the true Church of Scotland, her ſword and cenſures for what they have done, if they repent not.

## CHAP. III.

*The Abjuration of Prelacie in the ſolemne League and Covenant, vindicat from the exceptions of this Informer. Alſo* Mr Crofton *and* Timorcus *acquit of affoording any Patrociny to his cauſe. Dr Sanderſon ſtands in terms of contradiction to him in this point.*

BUt now this our Oedipus and doubt reſolver who hath acquit himſelf ſo dexterouſly in abſolving us from the nationall Covenant, marches up after the Seaſonable caſe, to try how he can play the abſolver as to the ſolemne league. And his Doubter making a wide ſtep to the 2d. Article [wherein he allegeth Biſhops are abjured, and that Proteſtant Biſhops are meant]. To this he anſwers, *That its not every kinde of Proteſtant Biſhops that is there intended, and that Timorcus* (pag. 14, 16.) *holds that all epiſcopacy is not abjured, but that they could in England freely Submit to the primitive epiſcopacy viz, the precedencie of one over the reſt; without whom nothing is ordinarly to be done in ordination and jurtſdiction* ——— *that they aſſert its only the Engliſh kinde of prelacy (expreſſed in the Article for that end) that is abjured, which we have not in Scotland. That Mr Vines and Gattaker aſſert, that its only that complex frame conſiſting of all the officers there mentioned, that is abjured* ——— *that the Aſſembly of divines was reconcilable to moderate epiſcopacie,* ——— — *That Timorcus holds that the Engliſh parliament & our commiſſioners were not againſt all Epiſcopacy, (citing likewiſe Mr Crofton pag. 70:71.) hence he concludeth that the Engliſh preshyterians would not cry out againſt conformiſts as guilty of perjury. Anſ.* 1. It is a very pityfull ſhift

to

to meaſure our obligation in Scotland againſt Prelacy, by the 2d. Article of the league, which relates to the Church of England, wherein only that prelacy was exiſtent. For ſince Scotland, from the time of our reformation never had ſuch a Prelacie as the adverſaries acknowledge, they muſt conſequently grant that the prelacie which that article engadgeth to extirpat, is not ſolely or mainly the Prelacie which we ſtand oblidged againſt in that Covenant, but a Prelacy inconſiſtent with Presbyterian Government (and under that formall conſideration) which in the firſt article we are engadged to preſerve. In order to which preſervation of our reformed diſcipline from our own Prelacie, the 2d Article, which doth relate to the extirpation of Prelacy in England and Ireland, is ſubſervient as a mean to its end. This is convincingly clear, for 1. *Extirpation* and *Preſervation* being oppoſite terms, and the laſt being made uſe of as to our Church of Scotland, muſt needs relate to Presbyterian Government as then eſtabliſhed, in all its previledges, which clearly excludes the epiſcopacy formerly exiſtent therein; And the *extirpation*, and *reformation* ingadged to in the 2d. Art. muſt relate to the then exiſtent Prelacy in England and Ireland, and that by way of mids leading unto, and for execution of the ends of *preſerving our own eſtabliſhed reformation*, engadged unto in the firſt Article. 2. We ſaid already that our Parliament did reſcind all acts againſt our epiſcopacy, togerher with the ſolemne league, and reſtore Prelats to the ſole poſſeſſion of Church Government under the King, declaring clearly that the *preſervation* engadged unto in the firſt article, cannot conſiſt with our Prelacie. Again, as this duty of *extirpation* is engadged unto in ſo far as is neceſſary in order to the *preſerving* of our own eſtabliſhed reformation, by this Church principally vowed and intended, ſo that clauſe in the

end of the 2d. Article, viz. [to extirpate whatsoever is found contrary to sound doctrine, and the power of godlines] amounts both as to us and England, to such an extensive engadgement in opposition to Prelacie, that it totally excludes it even in our adversaries mould, under this *formalis ratio* as thus opposit to sound doctrine &c. Which hath been cleared upon the first Dialogue.

Next, will this man deny that these officers, Arch-Bishops, Bishops, Deans, Chapters, &c. are not in *themselves* and simply abjured in that 2d. article, or that the Presbyterians in England would not disowne them as inconsistent with the Covenant? Sayes he not that it is only a fixed presidency of order which they are for? and is this all that Arch-Bishops and Diocesian Bishops do possess? have we not in Scotland Arch-Bishops, Bishops, Deans and are we not engadged to extirpat these in the 2d. article? how then can he say that it is only that complex frame with all these officers which we are oblidged against. Do not two remarkable clauses contradict this gloss? I we engadgeto extirp ate *all Ecclesiastick officers depending on that Hierarchie*, what? is it only all in bulk, and not all and every one? this were equivalent to such a wilde assertion, as if one should say that after the enumeration of these evills *schism*, *heresie*, *profanesse*, ——— which are thus Summed up, *whatsoever is contrary to sound doctrine and the power of godliness*, this engadgement did only relate to all these evills complexly, and not to every one *figilatim* or apart. 2. Whatsoever is contrary to sound doctrine in our principles, is there abjured as I said: but such are Bishops, Arch-Bishops, and I adde, whatsoever is inconsistent with our established reformation and with Presbyterian government, is also here formally abjured. In the 3d place, *Timoreus* is clearly against

our

our *Informer*, for in explaining what is that prelacy which is abjured, he diſtinguiſheth a Prelacie of *juriſdiction*, and of *meer order*. *The prelacie of juriſdiction*, he ſaith is twofold, the firſt is, whereby the Biſhop hath ſole power of ordination and juriſdiction (ſuch as is our prelacy now in Scotland) in which government *Timorcus* ſaith that *Miniſters* do meet with the Biſhop only *ex abundanti*, to give him advice, which is all that our Curats are allowed by law, as is ſaid above, and ſcarce that. The 2d ſort of prelacie he calls *paternall*, wherein the colledge of Presbyters have a conſtant Prelate or Preſident, who muſt concurre with them ordinarly in ordination and acts of juriſdiction. He interprets the Covenant expreſſy to ſtrick againſt *the Prelate with ſole power of ordination and juriſdiction*; which prelacy he calls *Popiſh* even though the Biſhop admit Presbyters to concurre with him in ordination and government. Now let this man ſay, ſince Timorcus (whom he will not aſſert that theſe others divines do contradict in this point) together with the parliament of England according to Timorcus, do diſowne ſuch a prelacie as is here deſcribed, and interpret the Covenant obligation as reaching the extirpation thereof, doth not this article of extirpation according to their ſenſe, clearly reach and cut off the preſent prelacie of dioceſian Biſhops and Arch-Biſhops, obtruded upon this Church? can he deny that they have the ſole power of ordination & juriſdiction, that all the power which Curats have according to our Law, *is to give the Biſhops advice*, yea and not that either, unleſſe he judge them to be perſons of *Known loyaltie and Prudence*. And ſurely if this precedency of meer order, here expreſt, be the only *primitive Epiſcopacie*, it is far ſhort of what our *Informer* pleads for, and will never come up to juſtifie the prelacie now exiſtent. And if in the ſenſe of Timor-

cus, and the other divines mentioned, and in the ſenſe of the impoſers of that oath, the extirpation engadged unto, cuts off whatſoever is beyond this *precedency of meer order*; it is incontrovertibly clear that even in their ſenſe, the prelacie now exiſtent is abjured.

That Mr. Crofton, and the Presbyterian Covenanting partie in England according to him, are not reconcilable to our prelacie, nor the Covenant in their ſenſe, appears evidently by his pleadings for the Covenant, againſt the Oxford men and others. In his Analepſis (pag. 74. 75.) he mentions a breviary of reaſons to prove [that the prelatical government in its formality is a plaine and clear papacie, and that *a Dioceſan Biſhop*, and ane *univerſal Metropolitan* or *Pope* differ only in degree and limites, not in kind] citing, and approving of Salmaſius and Beza's, calling epiſcopacie *a ſtep to the papacy*; ſo that the very office of a dioceſian Biſhop as ſuch, is as unlawfull as the Papacie in Mr Croftons judgment, it being with him a part thereof. Again (pag. 78.) whereas the Oxford men plead [that they cannot ſwear againſt epiſcopall government, which they conceive to be of divine or apoſtolick inſtitution] he chargth them and Dr Gauden, with ſophiſtick concealment of the *ratio formalis objecti*, and not deſcribing of epiſcopall government: And tells him that epiſcopall government may denominat a governmeut, *communi concilio Presbyterorum*, with a Moderator or Chaireman, *ordinis cauſa*, which he ſayes is of divine inſtitution, and exemplified act. 20. where Biſhop and Presbyteter are terms ſynonimous denominating perſons inveſted *with the ſame office and authority*. This he ſayes the Covenant ſtrikes not againſt, and the prelacie which is abjured he deſcribes to be a government wherein *one perſon is advanced into a diſtinct order of Miniſtrie above other Miniſters, and is in-*

*invested with Prince-like power over them, enjoying an authority peculiar to him eo nomine as Bishop, of sole ordination and jurisdiction, unto whom all other his fellow Ministers are subject, and must swear obedience to him* &c. I wonder if our *Informer* will deny this to be the characteristick of our present Prelats, or affirme that they possess no more authority in Church judicatories but *a meer precedency, ordinis causa*, which is all the Episcopacy which *Mr Crofton* holds that the Scripture, and the Covenant according therunto, will allow. Thereafter, (pag. 72.) He tells these Masters, that Christ gave his Disciples charge that they should not affect *superiority one over another, or princely power over Gods heritage*; and puts them to prove, that the *office of the Ministry, may in ordination be divided, or that there are more orders of the Ministry then one* (which our Informer still begs a supposition of) *viz. Bishop or Presbyter, or more officers in the Church then Elders and Deacons appointed by Christ, or his Apostles by their apostolick authority. That the Presbyter (in whom are required the same qualifications, to whom is to be yeelded the same obedience, subjection and respect, who recives the same ordination, and is charged with the same duty, and invested with the same power of feeding and governing the Church of God, with the Bishop, and none other) is an order distinct from, and subject to the Bishop, to be ruled by him, and not to exercise his office but by the Bishops licence, and that the Presbyter must swear obedience to the Bishop as his ordinary.* Which are the grand *postulata* and topicks of all this mans reasoning in point of prelacy. The autitheses of which tenets we see Mr Crofton most evidently maintaines as the sense of the Covenant in point of episcopacy; he further describes (pag: 80. and 81.) the prelacy covenanted against, and anent which he challengeth these Masters proof of a *jus divinum*, to be such *wherein one Minister or Bishop doth stand charged with all the congregatious and pastors* —

*of a Countie, or many Counties making one diocess ——— who is by office bound to a pastoral correction and government of them ——— that these Bishops may be subject to one Metropolitan Church and Archbishop, to whom they shall swear obedience* -- adding, *that if the Word of God conclude such superiority, over the Church in one Kingdom, it will conclude a Catholick superiority over the universall Church, and advance the Pope as warrantably above the Archbishops, as the Archbishops are above the Bishops, and the Bishops above the Presbyters, these not being differences of kind, but degree.* Adding further, *that no more is pleaded for Prelats divine or Apostolick right in the Church of England, but what is pleaded by Bellarmine, & the Council of Trent, for the Papacie.* Now from what is said, I darre referre it is this *Informer* himself, whither Mr Crofton doth not clearly disowne all the essentialls of our present prelacy, and hold it to be abjured in the Covenant; the office of our present Bishops and Arch-Bishops being incontravertibly such as he here describes. And whither Mr Crofton holds not our prelacy, arch-prelacy, and metropolitan primacy, to stand upon the same basis with the papacy, and to be equally with it, excentrick to the Scriptures; and that he esteems consequently the Bishops and Arch-Bishops (which I hope he will not deny to be abjurd in the Covenant) to depend (as such) upon the Pope as a part of his hierarchy. Next (pag. 81) he sayes „ that it is not the first sort of „ episcopall government formerly described, wherein „ all Ministers are invested with equal power and au„ thority or dignity, are all of the same order, and go„ verne by common counsel, but the specificall pre„ lacy last described, which presumes it self to be a *Hie„ rarchie:* So that with Mr Crofton our present prelacie falls within the denomination of the *Hierarchy* abjured in the solemne league, and of *the Popes wicked Hierarchie* abjured in the nationall Covenant ———

for

for he tells us in the preceeding page that none can deny that *a quantenus ad omne*, &c. He tells them moreover in that same pag. that „ had he lived in the Churches of Ephesus, Antioch, Phillippi, Creet, or the seven Churches of Asia, invested with the same ministeriall authority which he then enjoyned, he might „ have stood up *a Peer to any Bishops therein*; so that he esteemed no Bishop there, but Presbyters. Besides (pag. 82.) he cites severall writers to prove „ that the authority and distinction of Episcopall and Archiepiscopall „ chaires & metropolitan primacies, owe their institution to the Church of Rome, or politick constitutions „ of Princes. He tells us (pag. 84.) out of Cartwright „ and Whittaker ----- that the Church in respect of „ Christ its head (not his vicar, or superiority of single „ prelats) is a monarchy; in respect of the ancients and „ pastors that governe in common (all the Presbytrie) „ with like authority among themselves (not a superiority over them) it is an Aristocracie, and in respect the people are not excluded, but have their interest, it is a Democracy. The inserted parentheses are Mr Croftons; and let any judge whither he assert not with these authors, a Presbyterian frame of government opposit to diocesian Bishops and Arch-Bishops. In his Analepsis, in answer to Dr Gauden (pag. 2.) he charges him (as before the Oxford men) „ with „ an uncertain proposall of the object, and the *ratio formalis* of the Covenant obligation as to prelacy, „ under the general terme of *Episcopacie* (therein also „ lashing our *Informer* for the same laxness and ambiguity) telling them that by good demonstration [Bishop] and [Presbyter] have been asserted to be synonimous titles of Church officers, and are found to have „ been so used in the primitive times of the Church „ and of the Fathers------ adding, that the government of the Church by its Ministers -- in their severall

„ rall assemblies, with a Moderator *Ordinis causa*, „ to dispose and regulat what belongs to order —— „ is the primitive episcopacie —— which he grants „ to the Doctor, that the Covenant will not strike „ against —— then (pag. 3. and 4.) he de- „ scribes the Episcopacy which the Covenant strikes „ against. And pag. 5. summeth it up thus —— that „ the Covenant cannot be accomplisht by the remo- „ val of Prelats pride &c. *Whilst the Preeminence, pre-* „ *rogative, Paternal power, and juridicall authority assum-* „ *ed by them as distinct from, and above all other Ministers* „ *of the gospel, as the only immediat successors of the Apos-* „ *tles* (So our *Informer* makes them) &c. —— *are* „ *continued.* What will this Oedipus answer to Crof- tons assertion? Have not our Prelats this preeminence above Presbyters, as a distinct order from them? and have they not a juridicall authority over them, by our law and practise, and his pleading too? doth not Mr Crofton *in terminis* assert, that the Covenant obligation can never be satisfied untill such be removed? are they no more in Church judicatores, but Moderators and Chairemen, set up *Ordinis causa* to order the actions of the meeting? doth not our law give them a nega- tive voice in the meeting, and alloweth Presbyters only to give them advice, if their Lordships do judge them prudent and loyall.

Again, wheras the Dr, (pag. 18.) did conclude *that the Hierarchy being dead, must rise in another qualitie.* Mr Crofton tells him (pag. 6.) „ That if it arise ac- „ cording to the Covenant, it must be in the establish- „ ment of Congregational, Classical, Provincial and „ National Assemblies or Synods of Church officers, „ *Communi consilio Presbyterorum* (this phrase of Jerome „ he frequentlie useth) to debate and determine the „ affaires of the Church, and *Exercise all acts of disci-*

„ *pline*

„ *pline and Eccleſiaſtick power* —— each having a Preſi-
„ dent to propone queſtions, gather ſuffrages &c.
„ and no more. Which mould of government, whi-
ther it would not ſmooth our prelacie to a compleat
Presbyterian parity, let the *Informer* himſelf judge.
It is incontrovertibly clear from theſe paſſages of
Crofton, that even in their ſenſe whom our *Informer*
alleges to ſtand on his ſide, the preſent prelacie is
abjured.

Finally, as for the authors after cited, and that de-
claration of the ſenſe of the 2d article which he men-
tions, we ſay, as it is not clear (nay the contra-
ry is evident) that ſuch propoſals in explication of
that article, were either mad or approven by all,
or the ſoundeſt Presbyterians there preſent, ſo it is
als evident that if prelacy even as by them reſerved,
be found contrary to *ſound doctrine, and the power of go-
dlineſs*, that article of extirpation doth moſt clearly
and formally reach it. Neither are we ſo much con-
cerned in the problemarick gloſſings or diſputes of
any perſons in England (they not having tendered
that oath unto us) as in the obligation of this oath,
and that of the Nationall Covenant lying upon us, to
preſerve our reformation as it ſtood then eſtabliſht.
Moreover this man would take Dr Sanderſons advice
here that „ an oath being *ſtricti juris* — the meaning is
„ to be kept when clear from the words —— but if
„ it be doubtfull, every one is to take care that they in-
„ dulge not their own affections and inclinations, or
„ give way to too large a licenſe of gloſſing, to the end
„ they may with more eaſe looſe themſelves from the
„ obligation, or give ſuch a ſenſe to others, or take it
„ to themſelves —— as the unconcernd do ſee that
„ the words will no bear, both for fear of perjury
„ and enſnaring of others. Thus he, *de jur prom. præ-
lect. 2. parag. 9.*

The

The Doubter objects next [that we are not concerned in the parliament of England ſenſe, but in the ſenſe of the Church and ſtate of Scotland, who impoſed the oath, and meant it againſt all ſort of prelacie.] To this he anſwers, *that it being a common league of the three Kingdoms, the meaning muſt be determined by all the three; and that Timorcus ſhews that the Parliament of England their ſenſe was with concurrence of our Commiſſiners.* *Anſ.* 1. We have already made it good, that giving the *Informer* the advantage of the ſenſe of the 2d. article which he alledges, it will notwithſtanding clearly exclude our preſent prelacy. Timorcus telling us expreſly (pag. 16.) that the Covenant, *apertly obligdes againſt Arch-Biſhops, Biſhops, Deans &c. which termes* he ſayes *are lyable to no ambiguity, and particularly againſt all ſuch exerciſe of prelacie, as is by one ſingle perſon, arrogating to himſelf ſole and ſingle power in ordination and juriſdiction.* Darre this man deny that our preſent prelates have this legall prerogative expreſly allowed them by our lawes? is not all Church government to be managed by them with advice only of ſuch of the Clergie, as their Lordſhips (forſooth) ſhall judge loyall? ſo that the prelacie which Timorcus and the Engliſh are for, is point blanck croſs to the preſent hierarchie; and the three nations ſenſe of that article will (as we have proved) never be reconciled to his ſenſe and pleading in this point. 2. We told him alſo that it is not the 2d. Art. Whereby moſtly or principally our obligation againſt prelacy is to be meaſured, it being that which relates eſpecially to England, where Prelacy was then exiſtent; and whatever ſenſe any there do put upon that Article, yet they never offered to put any gloſſes upon our great engadgement to preſerve our reformation then eſtabliſhed, and never imagned nor offered the leaſt limitation of our obligations both by the National Covenant

nant as then particularly applyed againſt prelacie, and likewiſe our obligation in the firſt part and article of the League, to preſerve our eſtabliſht reformation, in Doctrine, Worſhip, Diſcipline, and Government, which conſequently ſtands inviolable according to its native and neceſſary meaning, in contradiction to our Prelacie or any Prelacie whatſoever, as he dar not deny that this Church and Nation at the impoſing did underſtand the ſame.

Our *Informer* permits now his Doubter to tell him [that we are engadged *to preſerve the Government of the Church of Scotland*, which was Presbyterian, and that therefor in the 2d. article we ſwear againſt all kinde of Prelacie, Prelacie and Presbytery being inconſiſtent.] To this he anſwers *that if we are in the 1. Article bound to maintain Presbyterie, and in the 2d left at libertie for ſome kinde of Prelacy, and withall if Presbyterie and Prelacie be inconſiſtent, then we have ſworne contradictions, viz, to admit of no kinde of Prelacie, and yet admit of ſome kinde of it. Anſ.* 1. He hath it yet to prove that either we or England are left to a latitude (according to the Genuine ſenſe of that Article) as to any prelacy, or whatever government elſe is inconſiſtent with Presbyterian Government, becauſe, 1 the generall oblidgements [to endeavour a reformation according to the Word of God -------- and to extirpat what ever is found contrarie to ſound Doctrine and the power of Godlineſs] will (as I have ſaid) neceſſarily import, both as to us & them, ane engadgement againſt all kind of Prelacy under this notion and upon this ground. 2. As for [Englands reſerving a latitude for a proeſtos] which he here alledges, Timorcus will tell us (out of Doctor Sanderſon) of this rule as to the interpretation of promiſſory Oaths „ that tho its granted „ that promiſſory impoſed Oaths muſt be interpret ac- „ cording to the ſenſe of Impoſers, as our private Oaths accord-

„ according to our ſenſe, yet both theſe rules are to
„ be limited, ſo that neither our private ſenſe of our
„ ſpontaneous Oaths, nor yet the ſenſe of thoſe who
„ impoſe Oaths upon others, *muſt be other then will com-*
„ *port, with the juſt ſignification of the words and phraſes,*
„ *in the Oath, vow, or Covenant*, for this were to de-
„ ſtroy [ſaith he] the ſimplicity neceſſary to every
„ Oath, and indeed not to interpret, but to coin ane
„ Oath or new obligation. Now the obligation of
„ both Nations in this Oath, is *to endeavour reformation according to the Word of God*, and *to extirpat whatever is contrary to ſound Doctrine and the power of godlineſs.* If therefore a fixt Moderator, or any ſuppoſed moderat mould of Prelacy be found contrary thereunto, no mans gloſſings whatſoever, can (according to this neceſſary rule) prejudge the native import, ſignification, and extent of theſe generall clauſes. In the 2d. place, his contradiction here imputed to us, is but his owne airie imagination, for it is not *ad idem*, and *eodem modo*. Wherein he imagineth the contradiction to lye. Our duty to *preſerve*, and our obligation thereanent, being relative to *the eſtabliſht Government of the Church of Scotland*, and the *extirpation* engadged unto, being relative to *another nation and Church*, wherein that ſpecies of Prelacy particularized in the Article, was exiſtent; ſo that there is no liberty left for any kinde of Prelacy in Scotland; and for Englands reſerving, I have told him that what ever gloſſes any may put upon that 2d. article, yet if the generall clauſes and expreſſions mentioned will exclude all kinde of prelacie, their gloſſes will not comport with the ſimplicity and genuin ſenſe of the oath, and therfor are not to be admitted. Since if it can be made good from the ſcripture that all kinde of prelacy is unlawfull, diſſonant to the divine rule, and repugnant to the po-

wer

wer of godlineſs, the oath doth moſt clearly ſtrike a-gainſt it.

„ Mr Crofton pag. 110. in anſwer to the Author „ whom he calls Dr Featly's ghoſt, objecting that in „ the Covenant, the Church of Scotland is ſet before „ the Church of England, tells him that it is in „ relation to different acts, the Reformed Religion „ of Scotland to be *preſerved*, of England to be *Re-* „ *formed*; that it is no Soleciſm to put the *factum* be-„ fore the *fieri*, to ſweare the *preſervation of good ac-* „ *quired*, before *ane endeavour to obtain* the ſame or bet-„ ter, to prefix *the pattern* to that which is to be ther-„ unto conformed. He adds, that his Antagoniſt „ hath little reaſon to grudge that Scotland ſhould be „ propounded as a pattern of Reformation to En-„ gland, ſince *Beda* reports that *this nation did at firſt* „ *communicat the ſcience of divine knowledge without grudge* „ *or envy unto the people of England*, citing his Eccleſ. „ hiſt. gent. Ang. lib. 5. cap. 23. Hence he infers, „ that it is no ſoleciſm to propound us *as a pattern of* „ *Reformation*, who had firſt obtained it, and from „ whom Chriſtianity it ſelfe was at firſt tranſmitted to „ them. Here let our *Informer* informe himſelf, firſt, that in the ſenſe of the Engliſh Presbyterians, [ the preſerving of our eſtabliſht Reformation ] is that arti-cle wherin our obligation to Presbyterian government is properly included; and that the article of Refor-mation yet *in fieri*, relates properly to England. 2. That they ſtate a diſtinction betwixt *preſerving* and *reforming* as diſtinct acts, the one relating to our Re-formation in Scotland already obtaind, the other to that in England yet in fieri, wherin they check this mans blunt meaſuring our obligation againſt prela-cie firſt and principally by the ſecond article, and his denying our obligation to preſerve Pretbyterian government containd in the firſt, and his blunt con-

founding the obligation of the two articles, to give ſome ſhadduw of his fancyed contradiction which he would faſten upon us, viz. [That we are bound againſt all Epiſcopacie in the firſt article, and yet the ſecond can admit of ſome.] For as we have before anſwered, ſo Mr Crofton tells him here again, that the *acts* and *objects* are different. The preſerving of the Reformation, government and diſcipline of this Church (which we ſee he holds to be Ptesbyterian government, according to our two books of diſcipline, and oppoſit to dioceſan prelacie as ſuch) is a different act and object, from theſe of extirpating Prelacie out of the Church of England. And thirdly, that with Mr Crofton, and the Engliſh Presbyterians, it is no ſuch paradox as this man afterwards endeavours to perſwade us, *that the Covenant obligeth them to Reforme England according to our pattern*, which we ſee they hold to be the *Scripture pattern*. For Mr Crofton tells his Adverſary that our *factum* was to be their *Fieri*, and our *acquired good* in point of government, the meaſure of *their good to be obtaind*, and that the *good* they were to obtain (according to the Covenant) was *the ſame with ours*, and tells him *in terminis* and expreſly, that our *pattern* is in the firſt article prefixed, to which they are to be conformed.

From what we have ſaid out of Mr Crofton touching his ſenſe of the Covenant, and the ſenſe of the Engliſh Presbyterians, who adhere thereunto, it is evident that it ſtrikes againſt all prelacy including the priority and power of dioceſan Biſhops and Arch-Biſhops; That prelacy diſputed againſt by Gerſon Bucer in his diſſertations de Gub. eccl. Didoclavius in his *Altare Damaſcenum*. Cartwrights Exceptions. Paul Baines his Dioceſans tryall. Smectymnuus. Mr Pryn in his publick and poſitive challenge for the unbiſhopng

of

of Timothy and Titus, cited by Crofton, pag. 83. *as unanſwerable pieces.* Yea all Biſhops whoſe office and authority is ſuch as Mr Crofton (to uſe his own expreſſion) *might not ſtand up a Peer to them in officiall power*, tho a ſimple Presbyter; ſo that our Informer is quite out in telling us that in their ſenſe the Covenant is reconcilable to our prelacy, and ſtrikes only againſt that of England. Again, Mr Crofton in the Analepſis, (pag. 129.) anſwering the charge of *Ambiguity* put upon that clauſe of [*the beſt reformed Churches*] tells the Maſters of Oxford, that the ſenſe is [*in endeavouring the reformation of England, the word of God ſhall be our rule, and the beſt reformed Churches our pattern.*] Wherein he clearly aſſerts with us, that the obligation of the Covenant, reaches the extirpation of whatever Prelacie is found contrary to the Word of God: But ſo it is that the Apoſtolick Churches (as we ſhall finde Mr Crofton here aſſert) owned no Biſhops but ſuch as he might ſtand up a *Peer* unto, ſo that the Scripture rule, and by conſequence the Covenant according thereunto, ſtrikes againſt, and cuts of all Prelacy of Dioceſian Biſh: of whatever Goverment doth admitt of any Church officers, above Presbyters. And in his ſenſe they are oblidged to reduce Englands prelacy or hierarchy, to a compleat presbyterian parity. The Scripture makes (with Mr Crofton) the Biſhop and presbyter meerly *Synonima*; So that no prelacy wherein a diſtinction is admitted, can conſiſt with the Covenant in his judgment; nor can any gloſſings of men prejudge this rule, and the obligation reſulting from this clauſe to extirpate Prelacy root and branch.

Our *Informer* might have ſeen this his notion further refuted by the Author of that peice intituled [*The caſe of the accommodation examined, pag.* 39. 40.] who ſhews „that in ſo farre as England had attained we might

„ close with them in a particular Oath, for extirpa-
„ ting an evill discovered, and yet for a further ad-
„ vance, rest upon the more general tyes so surely
„ cautioned, till God should give further light — so
„ that the engadgement of both parties expresly only
„ to extirpat that species, did no way hinder the set-
„ ting up of Presbyterian Government, and rejecting
„ of all prelacy to be Covenanted unto under the Ge-
„ neral provisions ——— That, it was aggreeable
„ to truth and righteousnes for us to concurre, with
„ that Church convinced of evills, but not so enligh-
„ tened as to remedies, in Covenanting against the
„ evills in particular, and also to endeavour a refor-
„ mation according to the Word of God, and by vertue
„ of this general oblidgement, become bound to
„ make a more exact search anent the lawfullnes or
„ unlawfullnes of things, not so fully clear in the
„ time of entering into the Oath, and after the disco-
„ very to reject what seemed tolerable. So that no
„ hesitation among them, doth hinder England and
„ Scotlands respective obligations to extirpate all
„ episcopacy as contrary to that doctine which is ac-
„ cording to godlines. What inconsistency will the Informer shew us in this, that one nation vow adherence to its owne establishment in point of reformation and Church Government, and likewise vow assistance of another nation in the removal of a corruption therein, tho the removall will not amount to such a compleatnes of reformation at first, as will be every way like unto this establishment, both nations being notwithstanding oblidged *respective*, under generall clauses to make this reformation compleat.

The *Informer* next tells us, *that it is doubted by the learned, whither in the first Article there be any obligation to maintain presbyterian Government.* His first reason is, *because there is no expres mention of presbyterian Government therin,*

but

*but only of our reformed religion in Doctrine, Worship, Diſciplin^e, and Government.* *Anſ.* this reaſon of the Seaſonable caſe which he hath borrowed, is very inſignificant. Our Church, after long wreſtling being recovered from corruptions both in Doctrine and Worſhip, which Prelates had introduced, and her Diſcipline and Government according to the Scripture patrern ſet up, in Presbyteries, ſynods, and Aſſemblies, and all the priviledges of theſe her courts, authorized and eſtabliſht both by civill and eccleſiaſtick conſtitutions and laws, will any doubt (but the ſceptick who will diſpute that ſnow is not white) that the diſcipline then reformed and eſtabliſht, is in that oath ſworn to be maintained. He may als well alledge that it is not the doctrine and worſhip then eſtabliſhed; which we Covenant to preſerve, as to doubt of the government; ſince this reformation then eſtabliſhed, takes in all the three together, and in the ſame ſenſe. Beſides his Maſter the Seaſonable Caſuiſt, grants that there was then in Scotland no ſuch offi-cers, as are enumerate in the 2d article, but an eſtabliſht reformed government was then exiſtent. Now dare any of theſe new abſolvers or reſolvers ſay, that it was not Presbyterian government, or that this was not the ſenſe of the impoſers of that oath. His 2d reaſon is, *that Independents took that Covenant, and had a hand in wording that article, that it might not import any particular forme of government.* ——— *That the words import no one forme of government, but with this proviſo, as reformed.* The Seaſonable caſe ſaid this already, to which the Apologiſt returned anſwer „ That the go-„ vernment of this Church at that time being Preſ-„ byteriall (as he acknowledged) there could be no „ other government underſtood, then what was then „ exiſtent, eſtabliſhed and reformed. That to ſay „ Indendepents underſtood it of their government, will

no more reflect upon the Covenant, then upon the „ Scripture it ſelf, which Independents do alledge „ will plead for their government. Next, I would ask this man, why may not the ſame inſignificant quirk be alſo objected as to the *doctrine*, and *worship*, viz. that only the doctrine and worſhip with this proviſo as reformed, but not the then eſtabliſhed doctrine, and worſhip, is underſtood in that article, and ſo ſectaries may lurk under this generall alſo. Thus he may alledge that no engadgement or oath in relation to his Majeſties authority will binde, except his name and Sirname be in it, becauſe ſome may entertaine a *chimera* of their own under his Majeſties general titles. Alas! what ridiculous conceits are theſe.

The Doubter next objects [that the Engliſh parliament, who together with our Scots Commiſſioners impoſed that oath, did by [*the reformed government*] underſtand Presbytrie which was then ſettled here, and that therefore we are to underſtand the oath in their ſenſe who impoſed it, whatever Independents think.] He anſwers, *by denying that the Engliſh parliament underſtood the* 1. *article of Presbyterian government, for then they would have thought themſelves bound to reforme England according to our pattern, but on the contraire in anno* 1647 *they told our Commiſſioners, that they could never finde Presbytrie neceſſary by any divine right, and charged them with Supercilious neſs in judging that there is no other lawfull Church government, but what they call ſo, and with miſinterpreting the article anent Church government.* This the Seaſonable caſe alſo ſaid before him, and this hungry caſuiſt catches up his *cibum præmanſum*, but could not ſee the anſwer returned to this in the Apology. To this I ſay firſt, that the Parliament of England tendered not that oath to us, nor is their ſenſe therof, principally to be eyed by us, as in his mould of the objection

ction and anſwer, he ſeems to ſuppoſe. The parliaments of both Kingdomes impoſed the oath upon their own ſubjects, framed by the conſent of both according to their own condition, and exigence; ſo that we are to look mainly to the procedour and ſenſe of our Church and ſtate, for a diſcovery of the genuin ſenſe and meaning of that oath. Now it is moſt evident that the deſigne of our Church and ſtate in framing and impoſing of this oath, was to eſtabliſh and preſerve our Church government then in being, which, he who denyes to have been Presbyterian, in its compleat formes, and courts, he may deny any thing. 2. We told him alreadie, that whatever defection or liberty of gloſſing any might be guilty of, yet the words and clauſes of the Covenant, as to that 1. article, are clear and abundantly ſignificant, and will admit of no evaſion. And in relation to the total extirpation of prelacie out of that Church where it was exiſtent, the 2d Article, is as clear and convincing. And therefore whither they lookt upon themſelves as oblidged to follow our pattern yea or not, we have proved that they ſtood oblidged, both by that particular enumeration in the 2 Article, and alſo in the more generall clauſes mentioned, to extirpate Prelacie root and branch. This man will make a meer Proteus of oaths, if their ſenſe and obligation muſt vary, turne ambulatory or ambiguous, according as men do ſhift or turne aſide. We told him of Dr Sanderſons rule, anent the import of the words of an oath, in their genuin ſenſe in reference to its obligation, whatever liberty men may take to gloſſe, or interpret, which is the judgement of all ſound Caſuiſts. 3. Dare he ſay, that ever the parliament of England denyed, that *de facto* Presbyterian government was compleatly eſtabliſhed in the Church of Scotland, or will he make them ſo irratio-

nall as to deny this neceſſary conſequence, that therefore the 1. Article of the Covenant doth clearly oblidge this Church to its preſervation as the reformed Government then exiſtent; and if his conſequence cannot but be admitted, ſurely whither they looked on themſelves as oblidged to follow our pattern yea or not they held no ſenſe of this article contrary to our own ſenſe, nor denyed our obligation to maintain our eſtabliſhed Presbyterian Government. And beſides, they never denyed their obligation to reforme the Church of England according to the *Scripture pattern*; and that *of the beſt reformed Churches*, in conformity to that pattern. And that the Church of Scotland, and other Churches where Presbyterian Government was exiſtent, were ſuch, was and is the ſenſe and acknowledgement of the reformed Churches themſelves, as from their confeſſions we have made appear.

For confirming this further (becauſe the Informer hath told us frequently of Mr Crofton) let us heare how he will beſpeak him in this point. In that piece intituled [The faſtening of S Peters Fetters pag. 40.] He tells the Oxford men „of the Church „of Scotlands Philadelphian purity ——— in deli„vering in writting, and excerciſing in practice that „ſincere manner of Government whereby men are „made partakers of ſalvation, acknowledged by Mr „Brightman on Apocalyps 3. and the Apology to „the Doctors of Oxford, and of Beza's epiſtle 79 to „Mr *Knox*, exhorting him to hold faſt that *pure* „*Diſcipline* which he had brought into Scotland, to„gether with *the Doctrine*. And (pag. 41.) he „cites the *corpus confeſſ.* (pag. 6.) Where the colle„ctor layes down this as the ground of that Chur„ches purity of doctrine, and 54 years unity without „Schiſme [that the Diſcipline of Chriſt and his A-

poſtles

„ poſtles, as it is preſcribed in the word of God, was „ by litle and litle received, and according to that „ Diſcipline, the Government of the Church diſpoſed „ ſo near as might be] which he prayes may be perpe- „ tually kept by the King & Rulers of the church. Theſe Engliſh Non-conformiſts, Beza, the Author of the ſyntagma, in Croftons ſenſe, and himſelf together with them, thus clearly avouching Presbyterian government, which Mr Knox introduced, to have been the government of this Church ſince the reformation, and which King Iames alſo owned. For after he hath told us in the ſame page „ of Arundel, „ Hutton, and Matthews, three Engliſh Arch-Biſhops, „ their approving the order of the Church of Scot- „ land, he tells the ſame Oxford men of the joy „ which King James profeſt in the aſſembly 1590 *that he* „ *was born to be a King of the ſincereſt Church in the world.* „ Again (pag: 39.) he makes mention of this Chur- „ ches two books of diſcipline, as the great badge and „ Teſt of her government; and in anſwere to the Ox- „ ford mens exception againſt that article of the Co- „ venant, which binds to preſerve the diſcipline „ and government of the Church of Scotland [viz. „ that they were not concerned in, and had litle „ knowledge of that government] he tells them, that „ he wonders how an univerſity converſing in all „ books, could profeſs they had no knowledge of „ theſe books. So that in Mr Croſtons ſenſe and in the ſenſe of the Presbyterian covenanters in England, the government engadged unto in that article, is that platforme of Presbyterian government contained in theſe 2 books of diſcipline, which adverſaries themſelves do grant to comprehend an intire frame of Presbyterian government.

Again (pag. 141.) he gathers from the tenor of the Kings coronation oath at Scone, „ that the royall

„ assent was given unto Presbyterian government *in* „ *pursuance of the obligation of the solemne league and Cove-* „ *nant*, and that, in his Majesties most publick ca- „ pacity as King of great Britain, France and Ireland, „ for himself and Successors: and asserting clearly „ the equity of the obligation, he asks the learned in „ law [whither the royall assent by such expressions „ publickly made knowne (as here it was unto acts „ and ordinances of parliament in his other dominions „ to be past here anent) be not sufficient to make an „ act of parliament a perfect and compleat law by the „ equity of the *Statute* 33. *Hen.* 3. 21. &c.] So that Mr Crofton clearly asserts our obligation to Presbyterian government to be contained in the Covenant, and to reach all his Majesties dominions. For he tells us in the preceeding page, „ that to all such as ap- „ prehend the constitution of England to be *Merum* „ *imperium*, wherein the King hath *Supremam Majesta-* „ *tem*, it is evident that his Majesties ratifying the „ Covenant thus, hath *rendred it nationall.* Again „ Timorcus (pag. 70.) asserts that the parliament who „ imposed the Covenant (anno 1648.) sent proposi- „ tions to the King wherein was demanded *the utter abo-* *lishing of episcopacie.* Which is point blanck cross to the character of that piece obtruded by the *Informer*, and doth evidently demonstrat (compared with these passages of Mr Crofton) that the whole body of Presbyterian covenanters in England, both imposers and takers, parliament and people, understood that article of Presbyterian government.

The Doubter here poorly grants [that England and Scotland did not understand that article in the same sense, but alledgeth that since our Church understood it of *Presbytry*, we are bound to it in that sense.] Upon this he assumes, *That it will not follow that we are bound to it in the sense of our Church and state, but rather that in relation*

*relation to government it is with out ſenſe, ſince the impoſers themſelves were not aggreed as to its meaning.* Ans. we have already made it good, both from the ſenſe and ſcope of the national Covenant, the judicial interpretation and application of it to our former prelacie expreſſie, the nations univerſall taking it ſo, and the authorizing thereof both by King and parliament, as well as by the recommendation of the aſſembly, from the total extirpation of prelacy, and ſetting up Presbyterian government in all its courts, in conſequence hereof, that that article of the ſolemne league which relates to the preſervation of the then exiſtent Reformation in doctrine, worſhip, diſcipline, and government, cannot without extreme impudence be diſtorted to any other ſenſe, then a preſervation of the Presbyterian government then exiſtent. Eſpecially the league being framed and entered into by us, for our further ſecurity in relation to what we had attained. And this being the article framed by the Church and ſtate of Scotland at that time, and this being alſo their ſcope and deſigne, diſcovered in their treaties with England, when that Covenant was entered into, I dare appeal this mans conſcience upon it, whither ever any demurre here anent, or any other ſenſe of this article, was offered by the Engliſh when the nations firſt entered into this oath? or whither, the impoſers thereof in Scotland, would have engaged in that league with the Engliſh, upon any other termes then theſe, and in this their ſenſe of that 1. article. Thinks the *Informer* that if any ſuch thing had been muttered in the firſt tranſaction of this buſineſs, that the Engliſh did not look upon the Presbyterian government as the reformed government of this Church, that the Scots nation would have tranſacted with whem in this league? Nay, when (as Timorcus tells us) it was debated branch by branch,

phraſe by phraſe in the convention houſe, in the parliament, in the aſſembly of divines, was there ever ſuch a notion as this of our *Informer* ſtarted, that by the reformed government of the Church of Scotland, Presbyterian government was not to be underſtood? in a word, dare he deny that the godly conſcientious Miniſters and people of England, did in the ſenſe of this oath, and even in imitation of the Scottiſh, or rather the Scripture patterne, plead for, and had begun to ſet up Presbyterian government, and are cloſs to their principles to this day.

But he adds, *that it is irrationall to ſay we are bound to it in the ſenſe of the Church and State of Scotland, becauſe they were but a part of the Impoſers and the leaſt Part. Anſ.* I told him already that in relation to the engadgers in Scotland they were *the proper impoſers*, the authority of the reſpective rulers of both nations, in relation, to their own ſubjects being firſt and immediatly to be lookt unto, and their ſenſe & ſcope therein to be mainly eyed, and each Nation being properly and immediatly judges, as to their own *national end* in this ſtipulation. Thinks this man, that the then repreſentatives of Church and State, did eye any other end as to Scotland, then the preſervation of the reformation in Doctrine, Diſcipline, Worſhip and Government, as at that time therein eſtabliſht. Moreover, the ſenſe and ſcope of the article it ſelf being convincingly incluſive of Presbyterian Government, it can admit of no other gloſſe without manifeſt diſtortion, and fruſtration of the impoſers deſigne therein. Next he tells us, *that ſuppoſe Presbytery were meant in the 1 Article, yet the 2d will admitt ſome epiſcopacie.* What poor ſtuffe is this. Suppoſe the Article of extirpation relating only to England and Ireland, would comport with ſome epiſcopacie (which the Informer hath not yet proved) what hath that to do with Scotland?

Or

Or how can that enervate our engadgement to preſerve the reformation as then eſtabliſht in Doctrine, Worſhip, Diſcipline, and Government? Becauſe in relation to the extirpating of Englands Prelacy after the reformation in Scotland is compleated and ſworn to, we are to bear with the English Church in ſome remaines of Prelacy, till God give further light, muſt we therfor be oblidged or allowed according to the ſenſe and ſcope of this Oath to corrupt or raze the Fabrick of that eſtabliſht reformation, and bring in again prelacy into that Church out of which it had been totally eradicate? Nay, this is too dull inadvertancie. As for what he adds *that Presbytery is not inconſiſtent with any kinde of prelacie.* I anſwer, that the presbytery eſtabliſht and ſworn to be maintained in Scotland, is, and Beza is ſo farre from diſowning this, that (as we heard) he exhorteth John Knox to keep that Church and houſe of God clean of prelacy, as he loved the ſimplicity of the Goſpel.

## Chap. IV.

*The grounds, upon which the* Informer *undertakes to prove that the obligation of the Covenant ceaſeth, although its obliging force for the time paſt were ſuppoſed, examined at large. As alſo his reaſoning upon Numb.* 30. *Wherein his begging of the queſtion, his contradicting of Dr Sanderſon and other Caſuiſts, and manifold inconſiſtencies are made appear.*

OUR

OUR *Informer* having ſpent his Maſter pieces, and the cheiſe products of his invention, or rather of thoſe who have gone before him, upon this difficult task of reconciling the Covenant to Prelacy, doth next (as a liberall bold diſputer) undertake to looſe the Covenant, even upon ſuppoſall of its preexiſtent obligation againſt it. And therefore making his Doubter tell him [that he bears off the acknowledgement of any obligation againſt epiſcopacie, either in the national, or ſolemne league, leſt he fall under the charge of perjurie]. In anſwer to this *he will ſuppoſe that epiſcopacy is abjured in both Covenants, and yet undertake to defend that they are not perjured who now ſubmit to prelacie.* The Doubter thinks this ſtrange Doctrine, and ſo do I. Becauſe [to ſwear againſt epiſcopacie and yet acknowledge it, is to do contrary to their Oath.] To this doubt he returns a large reſolution, but ſtill follows up the Seaſonable caſe cloſs, for fear of miſcarrying. And firſt, he begins with a threefold partition, *either prelacy* (ſaith he) *is an unalterable neceſſary Government of divine or Apoſtolick warrand, or it is ſinfull and contrary to the Apoſtolick Government, or thirdly of a middle nature, neither commanded nor forbidden, but leſt to Chriſtian prudence as found expedient to be uſed or not.* Here I muſt ſtope him a little, and minde the reader, that we did upon the firſt Dialogue, diſprove this indifferent Proteus-Prelacie, as a monſter to Scripture, ſince the Scripture condeſcending ſo far as to its inſtitution of officers, ordinances, Lawes, cenſures; and (as we heard himſelf acknowledge) ſetting down all ſubſtantialls of Church Government, prelacie muſt of neceſſity be either conſonant or diſſonant therunto, and by conſequence neceſſary or ſinfull, commanded or forbidden. So that he is to be limited to the firſt two, and

any

any ſuppoſal anent the indifferencie of prelacy, is but his *petitio principii*; and the gratification of his adverſary for further clearing of this queſtion: now proceed we. *If it be the Apoſtolick Government derived from their times to all ages of the Church, he hopes we will grant that no Oath obliges againſt it.* This I willingly grant to him, but what then? Why, *we muſt not cry out perjurie till what he hath offered on this head be ſolidly anſwered.* Let this bargaine ſtand, I hope I have made his Scripture pretences, appear to be vaine, and proven the contrariety of that prelacie now eſtabliſhed, both to the Scripture and pure antiquity, and till he hath anſwered what is offered upon this point, we may impute perjury to him by his own acknowledgment. What next, what if it be ſinfull? Then he ſayes *we need not plead the Covenant obligation.* No? may we not plead the Covenant obligation againſt Schiſme, hereſie, and profanneſs? May not the Oath of alledgance be pleaded againſt treaſon, becauſe before this Oath treaſon is a ſin? Said he not already that the Baptiſmall vow is a ſuperadded obligation, though the matter it ſelf doth binde? did not the Oath and Covenant (Neh. 8.) containe an abjuration of many ſins, againſt which the people ſtood before preoblidged? But he adds, *its true a ſupervenient Oath makes the obligation the ſtronger.* Right, why then may not we plead that which makes it ſtronger? Eſpecially againſt this man and his fellows, who have ſuch a mighty faculty of reſolving and abſolving all *S Peters fetters.* Sure they had need of Double nets who would catch a Proteus. Then he tells us, *That the ableſt champions for Presbytrie dar not aſſert epiſcopacie to be unlawfull.* What champions are theſe that prove it to be contrary to Scripture, and yet dar not aſſert it to be unlawfull? Sure they are very faint diſputants. We heard that Beza (whom our Informer will ſure call a *champion for Presbytery*) called

called episcopacy *diabolicall and the egg out of which Antichrist was hatched.* Was not that near the march of calling it unlawfull? But how will he now absolve us? Why, *it must be indifferent, neither lawfull nor unlawful,* and then the question is with him, *if we could by our own Oath, make it absolutely and in every case unlawfull, so that we can never after submit unto it.* He adds, *that we are mistaken if we think that an Oath against a thing indifferent will in every case bind.* Here I shall only tell him that since all his resolving skill goes upon this supposition, he should have travelled to *Utopia* with this resolution, since we do suppose and have proven Prelacie to be unlawfull, and so are not in the least concerned in what he saith upon this point: Since he is still arguing *ex ignoratione elenchi.*

But let us see how he will absolve us upon this supposition, which he must in pity be gratified with, before he can draw forth his weapons. Our *Informer* still stricks hand, with the Seasonable case and the Surveyer, telling us first, *that the oath ceases to bind, if the thing sworn against, be a matter wherein our superiours have power to command us, they by their authority given them of God, may require obedience of us in any thing lawfull, and so may in that particular, command us to do or use what we have sworn against, it being a thing in it self lawfull, and in this case our oath ceases to binde.* Ans. this simple notion, by our *Informer* poorly propounded hath no taste in it, and cannot reach our case, even though he had won over that insuperable mountain of the unlawfullness of prelacy, and had proven, or his adversary had granted it, to be indifferent, for 1. his supposition runs thus. *That episcopacy is indifferent to be used in the Church or not as it shall be found expedient.* Now, I beseech him, who is the *proper judge*, what frame of Church government best sutes her condition? is not the Church representative, to whom is intrusted the power of the

the keys? by what warrand will he bring in the Magiſtrate *primo inſtanti* to alter and ſet up Church government as he thinks fit, even granting it were indifferent? he ſought at firſt but a grant that prelacy was indifferent, but ere he can produce one reaſon for his point, he muſt have a further grant of *Eraſtianiſme*, and that the Magiſtrate is the proper competent immediat judge in matters eccleſiaſtick. Who can ſtope the mouth of this hungry cauſe of his, that muſt have multiplied conceſſions of the adverſary, and yet cannot ſubſiſt, but ſtarves with its own weakneſs when all is done. For 2dly, although this were alſo granted, what will he ſay in this caſe, wherein the ſuperiour hath bound and engadged himſelfe with the ſame Oaths, vows, and bonds that the ſubject is tyed with, and hath ſolemnly vowed to God againſt ſuch a frame of Government? Sure this will tye up his hands if we may beleeve the maxime aſſerted by Dr Sanderſon and other Caſuiſts that *juramentum tollit libertatem* even in a thing indifferent. Had we not the ratification of the Nationall Covenant with the band and explication againſt the Scots Prelacie, in plain Parliament by King Charles the firſt, under his hand writing 1641? Did not the King who now is in the Year 1650 and ——— 51, ſwear and ſubſcribe both this oath, and the ſolemn league and Covenant, and gave all imaginable aſſurances for upholding Presbyterian Government, and in oppoſition to Prelacy? ſuppoſe he had power to command in this matter, ſure his commanding power is tyed up, when he hath vowed and Open'd his mouth unto God, and lifted up his hand to the moſt high, *That Prelacy ſhall never be allow'd within his dominions*, far leſs commanded. Whatever power God hath given to Magiſtrates over their ſubjects, ſure he hath given them no power to looſe themſelves from his oath and vow upon them

Third-

is. Thirdly, it is too laxe a principle, to hold *that in every thing, in it self indifferent, the Magistrates power reaches to supercede or loose, the obligation of an oath or vow of the subject.* For a subjects *freedome and liberty*, as in that capacity, and *the Magistrats authority*, being coordinate, as the subjects liberty must not justle with the Magistrat's lawfull Command, suited to the ends of government, so neither must the Command of the Magistrate incroach upon this reserved liberty of the subject, who hath many things in his own power and without the reach of any lawfull command of the Migistrate. *A Subject*, and a *slave*, are quite distinct things. God restrained & set bounds to the power of Kings, and Magistrates whom he set over his people, so that they might not command such and such things. Therefor in what things soever, the exercise of a subjects liberty, crosses not the designe and end of the Magistrates power expresst in Scripture, his vow is without the reach of the Magistrates suspending or loosing power. Naboth would not give Ahab his Vineyard, no not for money. What if a man in a parentall capacity, interpose a vow as to his childe in reference to some occupation or inheritance, which are supposed, before this vow, to be things indifferent? Sure the Magistrates suspending power will not reach this vow. This will be clear, if it be considered, That the preservation of the Subjectes liberty, is one of the great ends of the Magistrates Authority.

The Second case wherein the *Informer* tells us, that ane Oath in things indifferent binds not, *is when the thing sworn is so altered in its nature, that it becomes sinfull and cannot be lawfully performed.* He tells us that Casuists say, That *cessat juramenti obligatio cum res non permanent in eodem statu Ans.* This other case generally by him propounded here, shall be considered & spoken to, when we shall see how hereafter he explaines and applyes it.

There-

Therefore we shall in this place dismiss it with one word, That Prelacy is now the same, and worse thn formerly, And therfor the premised maxime cannot reach his Conclusion in the least.

His Third case wherein he tells us, that the Oath in things indifferent ceaseth to bind, *is, when it is impeditivum majoris boni, which he sayes the Seasonable case and the survey of Naphtali, do apply to this Oath.* And how he applyes it we shall after hear, He tells us, they do prove, *that supposing Episcopacie lawfull, though it were meant in the Covenant, none should think themselves bound to stand out against it, our Superiours having commanded us to obey and submit to that government. And that he solidly repells what is brought by the Apologie or Naphtali to the contrary.* But how insignificantly either he, or these new Casuists, do loose the Covenant upon this Pretence, hath already in part, and shall yet further appear.

What a laxe Adiaphorist is this, who by his new divinity, first takes this great duty of *vowing* or *swearing* quite away; For, no Oaths must be pleaded in things necessary, in this man's judgment, They cannot in things that are sinfull or unlawfull have place, and so all the subject thereof must be things lawfull; and for this, there needs no more to make all Oaths and vows evanish, but a command from the superiour, and then they are gone. Secondly, he makes the Magistrat's posteriour and supervenient command, not only loose all his subjects from the obligation of what is lawfully sworn, but also himself from his personall Oath: Though he hath sworn and vowed never so deeply, he hath no more to do but to make a Law against it, and then the Oath, as *impeditivum boni*, ceaseth to bind either himself or his subjects. Thirdly, he makes all the reserved liberty of the subject (which Government is for preservation of) a

meer nullity and *Chimæra*, ſo as this liberty it ſelfe, or any vow or Oath in things which are properly within it's ſphere, evaniſhes at every arbitrary command of the powers. Hence a ſubjects liberty reſolves into a meer nothing or ſlavery. Fourthly, thus the Judgement of all Churches in Brittain and Ireland under this Oath, muſt in relation to the expediency of this ſuppoſed lawfull Epiſcopacy, and its preſent ſuitableneſs to her edification, be at the meer beck of this arbitrary command of the civill power, as the ſole and proper judge of this matter. And ſo.

Firſt, the Magiſtrate is not only the *immediat judge of all eccleſiaſtick Government*, or what is moſt ſuitable to the Churches State and edification in point of Government. But 2dly, *all judgement of diſcretion is taken away from the people of God*, in relation to this matter of ſo high importance, and their acting in faith conſequently, in this ſuppoſed obedience. So that men are made abſolutly Lords over their *conſciences*. Yea *3dly*, all regard to the *eſhewing the offence of the weak*, and the Scripture Rules in relation to their ſcandal, and ſtumbling, are made void; the meer command of the powers determining that matter, in the principles of this Informer. Yea Moreover, all our *Chriſtian libetty in things indifferent*, which Chriſt hath purchaſed with his precious blood, and which we are commanded ſo much to hold faſt, is cloſe ſwallowed up, ſo that both judgement & practiſe, in matters wherein God hath given a liberty, are tyed unto, and only regulable by, the arbitrary command of the powers: And what monſtruous abſurdities theſe are, the meaneſt capacity may judge.

As for what he adds here, *that an Oath about matters not ſinfull, is alwayes to be underſtood with this reſtriction, [ſo long as lawfully I may] which the matter thereof requires, becauſe the taker is under prior and greater obligations {viz*

*obedience*

*obedience to his ſuperiour and the like) then that of the Oath in a thing indifferent, and therefor when the prior obligation croſſeth this latter of the Oath, its obligation muſt ceaſe.* *Ans.* This prior obligation the *Informer* makes relative to the Magiſtrats command interpoſing, which according to his laxe and unreſtricted ſuppoſalls, makes all Oaths no ſtronger then a threed touched with the fire, and when applyed to our caſe, is utterly impertinent, becauſe; firſt, there are things in their own nature indifferent, yet within the ſphere of the ſubjects reſerved liberty; and Conſequently not within the reach of any lawfull command of the Magiſtrat, nor of any anterior obligation, to that of the Oath by further conſequence; and that the matters in debate are not ſuch, he hath not proved. 2ly, The Magiſtrate himſelfe hath by his own Oath (in this caſe) ſuperſeded and tyed up any right of commanding, which the *Informer* may ſuppoſe he had. 3ly, upon both theſe grounds, the performance of this great engadgement, can never juſtle with any lawfull command of the Magiſtrat. And by further Conſequence, 4ly, There is no greater or prior obligation in this caſe lying upon the Swearer, from the Magiſtrat's right, to breake or cut ſhort the obligation of this vow. All which is yet further convincingly clear, if it be conſidered, that this great ſuppoſition of *the lawfulnes or Indifferency of Prelacy* (which is the grand Topick bearing the weight of his Argumentation) is but begged by him, and as an almes, given by his Adverſary. But the contrariety of Epiſcopacy to the Scripture, which we have alreadie proved, being once ſuppoſed, it followes, that there is an obligation Prior to all Oaths, lying both upon King and ſubjects for it's Extirpation, but which is much more ſtrengthened by the Supervenient Oaths and vows of God upon them, for this great end.

The *Informer* adds further, *that our obligation to our Superiours, is Gods tye —— our Oath a knot of our own casting, and that when two duties at once seeme to require performance, and we cannot get them both satisfyed, the lesser should give way to the greater. Ans.* 1. The same God who hath enjoyn'd obedience to Rulers, hath reserved the subjects liberty, and Christian liberty, and by his authority salv'd and authorized Oaths and vows which are within the compass of that reserv'd liberty, so the last knot is of Gods casting as well as the first. And such Alexander-like absolvers or Cutters as our *Informer* and his fellowes, will find that they are hewing at divine cords, when the curse due to perjury shall enter into their houses and soules, if they repent not. 2ly, Hence in this case and question under debate, our obedience to the Magistrat (especially upon our true supposition of the unlawfullness of Prelacy, and of the Oath against it, lying upon the Magistrat himself) is sinfull; and so the comparison is betwixt *duty, and sin*, not a *greater and lesser duty*, which this man must grant is ever to be preferred. And besides, the *Informers* supposition, *that this Oath is a meer voluntary deed of our own*, which had so full a ratification of the Magistrates Authority, is among the rest of his *gratis supposita* and Beggings of the question, which we must send back to him with a lash, untill it be return'd with a due Testimonall of better proof then of his *Ipse dixit*. 3ly, Even upon *his own supposition*, Dr Sanderson will tell him, that any law made against an Oath, which is but spontaneous, if the law be alternative, to obey or suffer, the Oath will bind against *the active part*, and oblige not to obey the power in that supervenient command or Law, which is contrary even to the privat spontaneous Oath, *de Iur Promiss. Prel. Sect.* 9. But *a fortiori* much more will this oblige not to obey that Law, if the Oath be not only

only ſpontaneous, but hath been fortifyed by the Legiſlative power, yea and vow of the Superior himſelf, who Pretends to looſe it by his after-Law. 4ly, Whereas he alledges, *Gods putting us under the commands of the powers in this caſe*, and his freind Dr Burnet in this Argument, tells us that [our Oath being a voluntary deed of our own (as he *gratis* ſuppoſeth with the *Informer*) cannot prejudge the commands of our ſuperiours, which are Gods own immediat commands.] They ſhould know (as Timorcus long ſince *Informed* them Chap. 6. ſect. 35.) That the Topick of this Argument being, *The dominion of the ſuperiour over the Inferiour*, if the command or Law be the exerciſe of a dominion in things wherin he hath no dominion, the Oath will bind againſt ſuch lawes. This man and his fellows are ſtill talking of the prior obligation of obedience to the Magiſtrat, but they muſt know that the Magiſtrats dominion in this point muſt be inſtructed by a Patent from God the ſupreme Legiſlator, before we can acknowledge it. And if our Oath interferre with the exerciſe of a dominion which is without its due ſphere, ſure it interferres with no prior obligation which God hath lay'd upon us. Even Azorius (Mor. Queſt. l. 11. cap. 6.) will tell him, that an Oath will bind *Contra mores jure civili inſtitutos*, if the divine Law be in any thing croſſed thereby. Nay, Caſuiſts, even ſuch as Abbas, Silveſter, Azorius, Molina, Leſſius, Leyman, Sanches, Swares, do grant, That an Oath will bind againſt any civill Law, if it oblige *ad pœnam non ad culpam neceſſario*, to puniſhment, and not neceſſarly to ſin. And further moſt of them admit the binding force of Oaths againſt the Laws or commands of ſuperiours, *ubi materia legibus oppoſita ſine peccato fieri poteſt*, where the matter of the Oath, which is contrary to the lawes, may be performed without ſin it being *non contra jus naturale aut divinum*, that is, not

againſt the Law of nature or the divine Law. See Timorcus ubi ſupra. 5ly, Even putting epiſcopacie in the category of things indifferent, this Oaths obligation againſt it, will countervaile & overſway our obligation to obey the Magiſtrate, and ſubmit to his laws, In ſuch a caſe, wherin it is found *inexpedient for the Church*, and particularlie *for this Church*, as by its apparent dreadfull effects is evident; ſuch as the deſolation and waſting of this Church, the ſpreading of poperie and Arminianiſm, the Caſting out of many of the godlie Miniſtry, the fixed diviſion therin, the endleſs Confuſions and broiles, and therby the wide door opened to all Popiſh invaſions &c. For ſince the Magiſtrats ſimple Command cannot determine what Government is expedient or inexpedient for the Church, this muſt be ſuppoſed that *Prelacie is beſt*, before the Command can be, ſo much as ſuppoſed *Lawfull*, els the Magiſtrat may injoyne an Hundred Oaths this year in ſuch and ſuch things as he calls expedient, and null them all the next year, though himſelf be engadged therin, upon pretence of inexpediency of the Matter, becauſe of occurring circumſtances, which will make mad work of Oaths, and hang them all at the Magiſtrats *ſic volo ſic jubeo*, as to their obligation. Its true that the greater duty (as is clear Math. 9. 13.) counter-balances the leſs, but I Pray, ſhall *the meer will and Command of the power*, determine the greater dutie? and be the ſole and ſupreme rule to determine the Conſcience, as to the expediency of a thing *hic & nunc*. And though (as he ſayes) every poſitive precept oblidge not *ad Semper*. Yet he muſt acknowledge, firſt, that *it obliges ſemper*, and though not as to *the act*, yet as to *the eshewing the Contrary therof*. And Secondly, to *act ſemper*, except when Gods command ſuperſeds it, as to other duties in their ſeaſons. So that till he clear this in the point

point of prelacie, and that the renouncing of our Covenant, and presbyterian Government at the Magistrats Command, is in our case the greatest duty, this rule makes against him.

The Doubter, as to his first rule, anent the authority of superiours interveening, objects, ;, that its ,, hard to say that mans authority can loose the Oath of ,, God, since in this Case we must say, that we have ope-,, ned our mouth unto God, and cannot go back]. To ,, this he answers. 1. *That the law of God in the 5th Command layes the first and Primarie obligation upon us to obey our superiours, which Command we cannot bind up our selves from obeying. Ans.* 1. the same God who gave that Command, did by the third Command oblidge both superiours and inferiours, to be a ware of *taking his name in vain*, and therfor not to presume to break their Oaths and vows in any Lawfull matter, unlesse in such Cases as himselfe the blest and supreme Lawgiver, excepts; which he hath not yet letten us see as to this Oath, wherin both superiours and inferiours have entered, and therby oblidged themselves to God against what he pleads for. So that Gods reserved Supremacie, and Dominion, which (to use his own argument against him) is the primarie and fundamentall tye, upon which this 5. Command is bottomed, and according to which our obedience therto must be Regulat, will cut short the obedience to the superiour in this case, wherin we cannot obey him in the Lord, and without violating our fealty and alleadgeance to the God of Gods, and wronging his suprem dominion. 2ly, In this same 5. Command, God hath limited the Power of superiours, and tied them under many bonds of duties to their subjects or inferiours, which, in none of their Commands they must transgress, and if they do, their Commands oblidge not Inferiours to obey. Now, that this Loosing the obli-

gation of these Oaths is in our case an encroachment upon the subjects right and reserved Libertie, as well as christian Libertie, and an encroachment upon Gods sovereign right, is above Cleared. Next he sayes, *this were a way to frustrat the superiour of all obedience, and every man might pretend, I have sworn against such a thing commanded, therfor I cannot do it. Thus privat persons might prelimit themselves from obeying in everie thing. Ans.* in our case there is no such hazard, for the superiour hath prelimit Himself by *his own oath*, and this will not prelimit him upon such a pretence, from obedience in any thing that is Lawfull, or which falls within the Compass of his Power As a Magistrate and is suitable to the great ends of his Power, to say, that he cannot Arbitrarly loose people from a Lawfull Oath, sworn also by himself. But on the contrary, this pretended Informer his doctrine herein prelimtes and cuts short Subjects Libertie, and Christian Libertie, and Libertie of Conscience, subjecting it, and all Gods rules theranent, all scripture Rules of *Expediency* and *Edification*, and all Oaths and vows superadded to matters subordinat to these ends, unto the Magistrats arbitrary disposal and laws, which is a prelimitation equally if not more dangerous.

Our Informer in the next place for proof of this his doctrine, sends the Doubter to *Numb.* 30: *where* (he sayes) *the husband or parent is vested with a Power to null and make void the vow of the wife or daughter, and by Proportion the King, who is Pater patriæ, hath the same authority. Ans.* it will be a harder task then this man can well mannage to bring in the King here within the Compass of the *father* and *husbands right*, as to this absolving Power. For first, *the Magistrats Power* is far different from the *Marital* and *Parental*, and the relation betwixt King and subject is nothing so strait, as betwixt husband and wife, parent and Children, the

one being *natural*, the other *Political*, the one changeable, the other not. A man may chuse to Live under what Magistrat he pleases, but the woman cannot cast off her husband, nor the Child shake off his relation and dutie to the father. Besides, subjects set up their Magistrats and Limite them: But so it is not as to the *Marital* and *Parental* relations. The husbands authority flows not from the wife her *donation*, nor the parents from the Children. So that a parallel argument can hardly be drawen from the Power of husbands and parents, supposed in this text, in relation to Oaths and vows of the Children and wife, to that of the Magistrat in relation to his subjects. 2ly, in the beginning of that Chap. the Lords way of Laying down this great Sanction touching vows, seems to exclude the Magistrat from this absolving Power. For after the propounding of the Law touching the keeping of voluntary Oaths and vows, viz. *that the person vowing shall not break nor profane his Word as the Hebrew signifies, but do according to all that Proceeds out of his mouth.* 1. The Case of the wife and the Daughter not foris-familiat, is *Gods great and only exception* (expreſt in the Text) from his own rule, and Law, touching the strick observation of voluntarie Lawfull vows. So that, the rule and Law seems to reach *all other Cases*, as to free vows, except only this. 2ly, in the Beginning of the Chap. we find that Moses spoke this to the *Rulers and heads of the tribes*, but the text is silent as to his applying of this exception anent the father and husbands Power in absolving vows, *unto these heads & Rulers*, which should have been especially intimat to them. Hence it may be probaby Concluded that the Rule and Law touching the observation of vows, stands fast in all other Cases except these here expresly excluded, by the Great Lawgiver. So that ere his argument can reach us, he most give in Sufficient proof that the

Magiſtrat ſtands veſted with this Power, and falls wirhin the Compaſs of this exception, in relation to his ſubjects. Not to detain him here in tasking him to prove, that this Judicial ſtatute, as others of the like nature, doth belong unto the Chriſtian Church. But in the ſecond place, [Granting that the Magiſtrat is here meant, it will never ſpeak home to his Point, but much againſt him, for 1. the dominion of the Superiour being the ground of this discharge, wherin the husband and Parent have Power, if the matter of our vow be found ſuch as is excepted from the Magiſtrats dominion, the Informer muſt grant that this text will not reach our Caſe. And ſuppoſing the matter, antecedaneously unto the vow, to fall under divine Commands, this is evident beyond exception. But becauſe he beggs our conceſſion, that it was before indifferent, I adde, if it be within the Limits of our reſerved Libertie as free ſubjects, or of our Chriſtian Libertie, its ſtill on both grounds, beyond the reach of his dominion, and conſequently excluded from this exception, and the vow muſt ſtand and oblidge according to the Grand precept here ſet down; ſo that a hundred diſcharges of the Magiſtrat will never touch it.

We heard him acknowledge, that *by* [*diſcipline of this Church*] *in the nationall Covenant, the ſubſtantialls of Government is underſtood*, and that conſequently it binds therunto; So he muſt acknowledge that our ſolemn Covenant will inviolably bind to this divine Frame of Government, & no earthlie power can looſe therfrom, no more then from *Scripture inſtitutions*. And Doctor Featlie acknowledgeth *that people may Covenant, without their Superiours, to fulfill Gods Law*. Now, give us all Scripture Church officers, and their Rules of Government, & Prelacie ſhall be quickly gone, So that upon his conceſſion that the national or ſolemn league

do

do reach the ſubſtantialls of Government, or what is neceſſary for the ends of Government ſet down in Scripture, it will amount to that which we plead for; and he muſt grant it falls not under the Magiſtrats Dominion, and that his argument from this text is loſt. 2dly, this diſſent which looſes the vow, muſt be both *ane open diſſent*, and alſo *preſentlie* in the verie day he heares of it. *Qui ſero ſe noluiſſe ſignificat putandus eſt aliquando voluiſſe.* That is, he that declares a late diſſent, may be preſumed ſometimes to have given his conſent, ſaith *Dr Sand. de jur. prom.* This he cannot ſay as to our King. 3ly, It moſt *be conſtant*, the diſſent ſuſpending, but not looſing the obligation. The oblidging vertue being naturall, and inſeparable to the vow (as Dr Sand. tells us *de jur. prom. pag.* 3. *Sect.* 10.) when ever the conſent comes, the obligation returns. Now have not our King and Rulers conſented unto, and ratefied all our vows both in the nationall; and ſolemn league and Covenant? 4ly, This conſent of the ſuperiour once given, can never he *retracted by a diſſent again.* Whither it be before or after, he can never make it void, as the Text doth clearlie hold out. See Sand. 16. Prel. 7. Sect. 6. Now have not both the nationall and ſolemn League, the Conſent &vows of all our ſuperiours ratifying the ſame. So that this text every way pleads for the obligation therof; for this their conſent, once given, they can never revoke, far leſs their Oath and vows, but the vows of the inferiours, are thereby rendered for ever valid; as Caſuiſts in ſetting down theſe rules doe grant, ſo Aquinas, Filucius (Tract. 25 cap. 9.) Azor. (Moral. inſt. lib. 11. cap. 10.) Sanches (lib. 3. Cap. 9.) Ameſius (caſ. lib. 4. cap. 22. Queſt. 11.) Sand. (Juram. Prom. Prel. 4. Sect. 16.) But the Doubter objecting [this conſent and ratification of our ſuperiours, which therefore they cannot make void.]

He

He anſwers, *that by comparing the 12. and 15. verſes it appears, that after the husband hath by ſilence confirm'd his wifes vow, yet he hath a power of voiding it again, and ſhe is exonered of her vow, and bound to obey her husbands Commands.* *Anſ.* Although this were granted (as the Text ſtands in clear contradiction to it) that the husband might null the vow, after he hath confirmed it by a ſilence or tacit confirmation, yet it will not follow that his nulling power will hold, after he hath given not onlie a formall conſent poſitive, but alſo ſolemnlie vowed and bound his ſoule to the Lord, in the ſame vow, which is moſt evidentlie our caſe. Have we not the ſolemn vows, ſubſcriptions and Oaths of both King and Rulers, concurring with the vows of the ſubjects in this caſe? How then ſhall they looſe *their own vows*. 2ly, this wilde gloſs is expreſly croſs to Dr Sanderſon, and other Caſuiſts, their ſenſe of this caſe and text as we heard, who hold that if once the ſuperiour hath either tacitly or expreſsly, precedaniouſly or ſubſequently conſented, he can never by his diſſent again either diſcharge from the Oath or (ſo much as) ſuſpend the obligation of it. Dr. Sand. ſaith (16. Prel. 7. Sect. 6.) its a true rule, *quod ſemel placuit amplius diſplicere non debet*, what once in this caſe hath pleas'd the ſuperiour, ought never to diſpleaſe; Gods Word declaring it eſtabliſhed for ever. If he hath conſented (ſaith the Dr) either before or after, he can never afterwards take away its obligation. 3. He makes the text contradict it ſelf, for (ver. 7.) upon the husbands tacit conſent, and holding his peace in the day he heard his wifes vow, the Lord declares that *her vow ſhall ſtand*, & *the bond wherewith she bound her ſoule ſhall ſtand.* And (verſ. 14.) The husbands holding his Peace, *eſtabliſhes her vows* and *confirms them.* Now then, God having declaire that the vow ſtands, is confirmd, and eſtabliſhed as

ſoule

*ſoule-bond upon their ſoules*, by this conſent tacit or expreſſe how ſhall it be null, *and not ſtand*, by ane after diſſent? Sure [*to ſtand*] is here oppoſed unto [*not to ſtand*] upon the termes of the *preſent open diſſent in the day he heard of it*, which is the onlie exception. That which God declares to be confirmed, and to ſtand, upon the father or husbands conſent, admits of no nulling afterward by them; but ſo it is, that the wife or daughters vow upon the firſt conſent and ratefication, ſtands and is confirmed, as a *ſoule-bond*: ergo, it admits of no looſing by ane after diſſent. I prove the major two wayes, 1. *ſtanding and Confirming* here are oppoſed, to *nulling and making void*. And 2ly, this would make more Limitations then God makes, as to the Looſing of the vow; for there is no exception but that one, *of the husbands open diſſent, or the parents, in the day he hears of it*. This is the onlie exception from the rule in the 2d vers. anent the binding of the vow. But this mans gloſs brings in another limitation croſs to the very ſcope and expreſs ſenſe of the words viz. *the husbands diſſent, after he hath by a previous conſent ratefied the vow*. That God admits the vow to ſtand, upon this expreſs or tacit conſent, is evident in the text.

As for the reaſon which he adds, viz. *That the wife is under a prior obligation to obey her husband*; it is abſurd and ridiculous, for will he carve our ane obligation in this point beyond what God hath ſo expreſly limit and declard. This were to give the husband a power, not over the wife onlie, but over God himſelf, and his expreſs declarator. As for that clauſe (ver. 15.) *that if he ſhall any wayes make them void, after he hath heard them, then he ſhall bear her iniquitie*. What a wilde inference is it, from hence to conclude ane abſolving power, in expreſs contradiction to the text, and the limitations previouſlie ſet down. To ſay that the

vow

vow cannot be looſed, unleſs the father or husband *declare his diſſent in the day he heares of it*, And that *if he hold his peace he hath confirmed it, and the bond and vow ſhall ſtand*; And yet that after all this, *he may looſe it by ane after diſſent*, is ſo plain a contradiction, that none can be plainer. If we will make the text then conſiſtent with it ſelf, the plain meaning is, that he ſhall bear her iniquitie, or the guilt which otherwiſe would have lyen upon the wife or daughter, if not hindered in the performance. That the guilt and puniſhment of the non-performance ſhall ly upon him who hindered the ſame, doth clearlie import the non-performance of it ſelf to be a guilt (which contradicts his pleading and argument.) But the poor votarie being hindered, it lyes upon the hinderer as I ſaid. So that we ſtrongly inferr from this, the binding force of the vow, ſince the Lord terms the non-performance a guilt: as violent men hindring Miniſters to preach, ſhall bear their guilt and puniſhment, which otherwiſe they were expoſed unto if neglecting this great work. All do know, what theſe Scripture-Phraſes of bearing his judgement, bearing his iniquitie, being partakers of Other mens ſins, do import. Which Confirms this anſwer. His comments upon this phraſe are verie vain [firſt he ſhall bear her ſin (ſaith he) if a guilt] what is that? bear a guilt, if a guilt, ſure *a repugnantia in adjecto*. His next gloſs makes the husband *ane expiator of the guilt becauſe ſhe did her dutie in obeying him, who revoked his Confirmation upon juſt grounds*. What, upon juſt grounds contrary to Gods command? this is ane odd expoſition. Doth God give the leaſt warrand here to abſolve and null the vow, after it is ratefied by his previous conſent.

Mr. Poole in his annotations renders thus the ſenſe of this 15. verſe [after he hath heard them &c.] and

„ and approved them by his ſilence from day to day, „ if now after that time ſpent, he ſhall upon further „ thoughts diſlike and hinder it, *which he ought not „ to do.* Her non-performance of her vow ſhall be „ imputed to him, not to her: Where, as he doth clearly aſſert (with us) that *her iniquity*, mention'd in the cloſe of the verſe, is the iniquity of the non-performance of the vow, which is imputed unto the husband, ſo, *that he ought not to hinder* the votarie, or ſtop this performance after that he hath confirmed the vow by ſilence; in plain contradiction to the Informers phantaſtick gloſſes and inferences. Wherin altho he pretend a concurrence of Interpreters, expounding this verſe of the husbands Lawfull voiding of the wifes vows after his previous confirmation, yet he hath produced none of their names.

The Doubter enquires next how he applies his Second rule, *anent things ſworn their not abiding in the ſame ſtate, to the Covenant.* He anſwers, *that upon ſuppoſition that Prelacie is Lawfull, and abjured in that Oath, the great change now is, that Prelats are again Eſtabliſhed, and ſubmiſſion to them commanded. So that we are now bound to obey authoritie herin, and not to keep the Oath.* And this is verie ſutable to his large abſolving gloſſes, which we have alreadie heard and refuted, and which is Likewiſe removed by what we have ſaid, anent the *matter* of this vow, which is not capable of any ſuch abſolving trade as is now ſet up. Theſe mens plagiary faith and divinitie, makes all vows no ſtronger then ſtraws. Though the Magiſtrats and ſubjects univerſallie vow, yet a Law (if the matter be not abſolutlie neceſſarie, though never ſo expedient and edifying) makes it *ipſo facto* null and void. If he had letten us ſee any greater good, expediencie, or neceſſitie *of prelacie*, then *in keeping this vow*, he had ſpoken

ſpoken to the purpoſe. But this neither he nor any of his party will ever do.

In a word this lax rule as here interpret by him, will inferr many abſurdities, as 1. that the meer Law looſes the obligation of the vow and Oath, though the matter therof falls not under the dominion of the Ruler. Which, 2ly, it doth not if it be either expedient or neceſſarie, and yet the meer Law (with him) robs it either of expediency or neceſſity. And thus, 3dly, mans law ſtepps up above the divine Law, authorizing the matter of the Oath upon the forementioned grounds. 4ly, He makes the expediency of the Law, and its being wholſome or no, cognoſcible by no anterior or ſuperiour Rule, but its ſelf, and the meer will and power of the Magiſtrate, and to be obeyed upon that ſole ground. 5ly, hence the *obedience* therof *in faith*, is excluded, and no acts of obedience can flow from ſpirituall knowledge.

The Doubter next objects [that his Oath againſt Biſhops had the firſt obligation, and therfor he cannot be looſed by the after Law.] To which he anſwers, *that the 5th. command, and ſubmiſſion to the ordinance of man, had the firſt obligation, and that obedience to authoritie comes under the baptiſmall vow —— that to ſay our Oath will oblidge againſt the Magiſtrats Command to the Contrary, will elude the expreſs precept Ecl. 8. 2. to obey the kings command in regard of the Oath of God.* *Anſ.* This is nothing but what we have heard, repetitions *ad nauſeam*, and ſtill *idem per idem*. Our obligation in the 3d command, *not to take Gods name in vain*, and to keep and ſtand to all Lawfull Oaths, and vows, unleſs in caſes which God himſelf excepts, is ſurly a verie arlie, and a baptiſmall obligation, prior to any Law of the Magiſtrat, and ſuch as no authoritie and Laws of men can evacuat and enervat; and our obedience *to the ordinance of man*, or the higher and

Lower

Lower Powers, *being for the Lords ſake*, that is upon the motive of his authoritie, doth infer, that we muſt not dare to croſs his authority, under pretence of obedience to the powers, in breaking lawfull Oaths and vows which he has commanded us to keep. Sure no Laws of men can ſuperſed this obligation. That the Oath under debate is ſuch, hath been already made good, and needs not be here repeated. As for that of Eccl. 8. 20. It makes clearlie againſt him; the Engliſh annotations having upon that text, mentioned the mutuall tye, oath, and Covenants betwixt King and ſubject, inſtancing 1. Chron. 11. 3. do tell us „that „ this is not only ane enforcement of the duty of ſub- „ jects, but likewiſe, that the clauſe contains a li- „ mitation, by which our obedience to men *is bounded*: „ And thus they ſenſe the precept, *keep the Kings com- mand, yet ſo that thou do not violat thine Oath and obedience due unto God. Our ſervice to the one* (ſay they) *muſt be ſuch as will conſiſt with our fealty to the other. We are bound to God and his ſervice by* Oath *and Covenant, and no ſubor- dinat obedience to others, muſt make us forget our duty to him.* Which clearlie croſſes this *Miſs-Informers* ſcope who would perſwade to perjurie and breach of Cove- nant with God, upon pretence of fealty to the Magi- ſtrat.

Mr Poole in his annotations having told us „ That „ the firſt branch of the verſe is not to be underſtood „ univerſally, but of ſuch commands as do not croſſe „ the commands of God, expones *this Oath of God* „ mentioned in the ſecond part of it, either of the „ Oath we are under to keepe all Gods Laws, or the „ ſubordinat Oath of fealty and allegiance. But adds, „ that this alſo may be underſtood, and is by learned „ Interpreters taken, as *a limitation of their obedience to* „ *Kings*, the words being thus rendred, as the He- „ brew (ſaith he) will very well bear, *but according*

„ *to the Word of the Oath of God*, obey the Kings com-
„ mands, with this caution that they be agreeable and
„ not contrary to the Laws of God, which thou art ob-
„ liged by thy own and thy parents Oaths oft renewed,
„ to observe in the first place.

As for what he adds (out of the grand case) *anent Iesuites Oath in Rome to preach in England Catholick doctrine, and of a Law made in England against the same.* It is so palpablie impertinent and unsuteable to the point, that I wonder at the mans confidence in presenting to the world such poor trifling fopperies in so weightie a matter. Dare he say that the matter of our vows, which our Rulers themselves have taken, is in any measure like to this. Nay, doth he not suppose the *Matter* of this Oath to be *Lawfull*, he must then confess this instance to be most impertinent. But the knack is, *That abstracting from the unlawfullness of the Matter, it was declair'd, that ane Oath cannot bind against a Law, although the Law be made even after the Oath is taken.* This was no doubt a lax determination, And such as he dare not himself subscribe unto in everie case; what, an Oath cannot bind against a Law *in universum*, and simply? what if the matter be necessarie, or falling under divine Prescriptions or institutions? What if convincingly expedient in its circumstances? Will this Law, yea and after the Oath is taken, overrule the divine Law determining the same? Well resolved Mr Informer. You may go sell absolutions anon of a high rate.

Come we now to his third case, *anent the Oath hindring a greater good, then the performance will amount to, and the dissolution therefor upon that ground.* This the Doubter thinks [will furnish people with a readie excuse to free themselves of Oaths, by alledging that some greater good is hindered therby.] To this he answeres

1. *That Casuists admit this rule with these limitations viz. when* „
that

*that greater good is certain, and no otherwise attainable, but by the discharge of our Oath, and a good to which we are preobliged before we took the Oath.* *Ans.* We shall not much contend about these rules & limitations of this Maxime *in thesi*, or in the generall, only I shall adde some more limitations here. That 1. This greater, certain, & no otherwise attainable good, must be such, *not in our apprehension only, but according to the Rule of the Word*, for otherwise we are just where we were as to the hazard of perjurie, if every mans [thinks so], or the Magistrats [arbitrarie Laws] shall be the only Rule to determine this, as this *Informer* makes all resolve thereunto which he pretends in this case, in relation to that greater good, which he offers in breaking this Oath. Hence Gregorius Sayrus (clav. reg. l. 5. cap. 8. n. 15.) having determined that every man hath a power to commute ane oath for something better, is opposed by Silvester and others, who say, that the Pope must determine the good to be better. So rationall and Consequent to their Principles are even Papists in this point. And must not Protestants be ashamed to refuse this limitation, that the Scripture (with us the onlie, and supreme rule) must determine this greater good. Next, Timorcus will tell him, that the Oath thus irritat, *must be onlie made to God, for if it be to our brother, and for his advantage, we must have his consent as necessarie towards the commutation.* This he tells us, is agreed upon by Casuists, as well as the other limitations. To these we adde Dr. Sand. rule (*de jur. prom. Prel.* 3. *Sect.* 12.) that, „*is precise ob hoc quod videtur impeditivum majoris boni, obligandi vim non amittit.* Id est, *That the Oath loseth not its obliging force, meerly because it seems the hindrance of a greater good,* unless other circumstances also concurr (as usu-„allie there do) which either evince it unlawfull, „or not obliging. His reason is because in all cases

„ it is not true that everie one is oblidged to do what is „ beſt, he means, *ſimpliciter*, and abſtracting from „ the preſent circumſtances) ſince this would open a „ flood-gate for all manner of perjury. As for that limitation (preſented with an *eſpecially* as the main one) anent the Oaths hindering the greater good, *to which we were preoblidged*, which this man foiſts in, to make way for his nauſeating repetition, anent *the Magiſtrats power*, it may be alledged that it is not conſiſtent with it ſelf: for if we ſtood Preobliged to this greater good, it renders the Oath *ab initio* null, for the ſame cauſe on which it is looſed upon the proſpect of that greater good. The greater obligation (as he ſayes) ſtill overruling the leſſer, & ane Oath in prejudice of a greater obligation, and contradictorie therto, can lay on no obligation, for ſo we might be under contradictorie obligations according to his way of reaſoning about the Magiſtrats power. [I will have mercie and not ſacrifice] is one of his illuſtrating inſtances. So that the obligation of the Oath, according to his reaſoning in this matter, was like unto this inverted rule, viz. Sacrifice and not mercie, and being ſuch *ab initio*, it could not bind. I know (as Dr Sand. ſaith) that which is abſtractedly and *ſimpliciter* a greater good, may *hic & nunc*, and in ſuch a complex caſe become the leſſer, *conſideratis conſiderandis* all circumſtances taken in. But this he admits not, for he adds unto the known rule anent the greater and certain good in its time and circumſtances, that other limitation anent the vower his being preobliged unto it, which can no otherwiſe be underſtood then in oppoſition to the obligation of the vow, unleſs this his added limitation be redundant, or non-ſenſe.

But 2dly, let us come to the aſſumption, what is that greater good, attainable in breaking this Oath and vow rather then in keeping it. This he tells us is

*obedi-*

*obedience to authority* (that's the *panacea* curing all wounds the universall, topick, and *primum mobile*) *avoiding of Schisme, Ministers serving God, in the work of the ministry to which they are called; these* he sayes *are greater and better goods then adhering to the Oath in a thing indifferent* Then he adds, *that Ministers should consider whither is be better to lay aside their Oath, then their Ministerie.* (*Especiallie ane Oath about a thing indifferent*) *and incapacitat, or do that which by consequence incapacitates them for the Ministerie — that Ministers think that by their Oath they are obliged not to continue in their stations, as matters now stand, and yet divines hold that the lesser duty gives place to the greater, as David did eat the shew bread rather then starve, Paul and those with him, did cast their goods into the sea &c.* In *Answer* to this, we need not much enlarge, it being nothing but what is upon the matter already objected and answered. 1. If the Oath, for its matter contain important duties falling under divine commands, and unalterable obligations, if Prelacie be contrary unto divine prescriptions in point of Government, & the disowning of it consequently be a standing necessarie duty (which we do suppose and have proved, and he cannot disprove) then this man himself will grant that all this tatle about *the greater good in breaking the Oath*, is to no purpose. 2ly, say prelacie were but indifferent, yet upon the supposall of *the greater expediencie* of Presbyterian Government for this Church then Prelacie, and upon the certain supposition of all *the Rulers engadgement in this Oath* and vow to God against it, (the first of which suppositions he hath not disproved, and the 2d he cannot deny) it is certain, that both Rulers and Ruled their keeping the Oath, is a far greater & more certain good, then their breaking it. 3ly, let Dr Sand. limitation here again come in viz. „ That the Oath is not precisely loosed because it „ seems to contradict a greater good, unless Other cir-

„ cumſtances do alſo occurr, which either evince it „ to be *unlawfull*, or not oblidging, and that its not „ true that in everie caſe we are *bound* to do what is „ beſt, that is unleſs *omnibus penſatis*, and *cæteris Paribus*, all circumſtances duelie pondered, it be found beſt; and then the Queſtion is whither it were beſt for Rulers or ruled to keep this Oath for theſe great ends which he mentions, than to break it. Whither it be a greater good to keep a Lawfull Oath, though I ſuffer under authoritie levelling againſt it, or break it to pleaſe men? or whither I ſhall chuſe the evill of ſuffering or ſinning? (for he hath not yet proved that the interpoſing of the Rulers meer Law or authoritie, will make this Oath unlawfull, & we have ſhewed that Caſuiſts mantain the Contrary.) Whither peace with God be a greater good in keeping his Covenant, then peace with men and with the world in breaking it? This Queſtion was ſoon reſolved with Elias. The children of Iſrael have forſaken thy Covenant ——— and I onlie am left &c. 4ly, This greater good, he acknowledges muſt be ſuch, *as is no Otherwiſe attainable then by breaking the Oath.* Hence the Queſtion will be, *whither the Goſpel might not have been preached, ſchiſme avoided, and God ſerved in the Miniſterie of the word, by keeping this Oath and Covenant with him?* This man will come to a great height of impudence if he deny this. Nay, if he deny that this good might have been thus beter obtain'd. He alledges we have now a great Schiſme by Presbyterian Miniſters departing from their party, and he will not deny that many excellent preachers are Laid aſide, the Magiſtrat is diſpleas'd and diſobeyed, all filled with confuſion and diſorder, poperie like to creep in &c. Now, had not all this been eſhewed by keeping our Covenant with God? The goſpel had been preached by Presbyterian Miniſters, and he will not deny that all his party of Conformiſts

too,

too, had keeped their ownstations, this schisme had been avoided, and the Magistrat obeyed while commanding for God. So that this rule everie way makes against him. And in stead of obtaining *a greater good* by breach of Covenant, we have lost the greatest good, *the gospel and peace with God*, and incurred much sin and miserie.

I know he will say that he speaks upon the supposal of the Rulers disowning the Oath, and Establishing prelacie. But then I urge him thus, 1. Since he cannot but grant that the keeping of the Oath, or holding fast Presbyterian government, would have had the forementioned advantages following upon it, shall the meer pleasure of the Rulers cast the ballance, and disprove its native tendencie *sua natura* towards the formentioned effects? the matter of the Oath is still of it self, or of its own nature, more productive of these good effects; & Consequently the keeping is to be preferd to breaking of it, which is attended with evils counterballancing these apparent good effects, which he imagins to attend this breach. 2ly, if the Oath cannot be commuted or changed, but for *a greater good*, and all these good effects mentioned, might have been *better, & more certainlie attaind*, by keeping then breaking it, then the Rulers commuting the Oath, or altering or breaking of it, he must acknowledge to be sinfull *upon his own ground*. Since they might have attaind these good effects of obedience, preaching the gospel, and unity, by keeping this Oath, and might have more surelie and better eshewed the forementioned evils then by breaking it. And then, let him in the third place seriously Consider, whither the Rulers sin in commutting or breaking this Oath, for neither a greater, nor more certain good, will warrand my breaking of the Oath to follow them in that sinfull course, and loose me from my obligation. 4ly, It will

hence follow, that he playes the petty ſophiſter here, in calling diſobedience to the Magiſtrat, is this one point of a ſinfull command in relation to this Oath, (which on the formentioned grounds is proved Sinfull) *a diſobeying of authoritie.* For he dare not ſay that *diſobeying a ſinfull command* can come under this character. And the true ſtate of this Queſtion is not, whither it be a greater good, to obey the Magiſtrat or keep ane oath? but whither it is a greater good in this particular to obey him, in Embracing abjur'd Prelatie, or to ſtand to the Oath; and the iſſue of this is, whither it be beſt for the Church of Scotland to have or want Prelats? which, from what is ſaid is ſoon determined. 5ly, What if theſe *pretended good iſſues*, be countervaild by *greater evills*: ſuch as perſecution of many thouſands, godlie faithfull Miniſters and Profeſſors, laying waſte Gods heritage, Blood, miſerie, confuſion, ſchiſme, (the godlie adherers to this Oath, being without all queſtion this Pure Church) famine of the word &c. Nay, according to Dr Sand. rule mentioned, where is the *Relaxation of all parties* engadged in Covenant one with another, as well as with God? were not the Churches of both nations nay in all the three Kingdoms, engadged to one another in this Oath? now thinks he not that this proſpect *of a greater good in breaking this oath*, ſhould have been laid to the eye of the repreſentative Church in the three Kingdoms, in order to the change of government. And ſhould not all parties engadged in this Covenant, have diſpenſed with it, and with one another in contemplation of this greater good, and for obtaining this better government? thinks he that ſuch a great queſtion as this: *What is this greater good in point of Church Government?* And that other Queſtion. *Whither ſuch great and ſolemn Oaths may be laid aſide in order to the obtaining of it?* Are Finally decided by *the Magiſtrats Law* with-

without the leaſt owning *the Church repreſentative*? and beſides, he dare not ſay that all are bound to obey the Magiſtrat in all things indifferent. Is not *ſubjection* (by the acknowledgement of moſt, and even of his Maſter the ſurveyer) different from *active obedience*.

Finally, as for what he ſayes of Miniſters, the Apologiſt told him, and his maſter the Seaſonable caſe, and I do tell him again, that God calls no man to preach the goſpel by ſuch ane unlawfull meane as perjurie and breach of Covenant, and that in this caſe Miniſters ſuffering for truth, is a Confirmation of the goſpel Phil. 1. 12. That in deſerting and not preaching, they are meerly paſſive: being perſecute for their integritie; ſo the charge and guilt of not preaching lyes upon their perſecutors. Beſides, the ſtate of the queſtion in truth, and in our principles importing a competition betwixt *ſin* and *ſuffering*, and *duty* and *ſin*, not a *leſſer* and *greater duty*, the folly and impertinency of his inſtance, anent *the leſſer duty overruled by the greater* (exemplified by that, *I will have mercy and not ſacrifice*, repeated here *ad nauſeam*) as alſo that inſtance of Paul and thoſe with him, their caſting their goods in the ſea &c, is moſt evident. The ſin and perjurie of this courſe of conformitie, being our principle, which he cannot diſprove, even though we ſhould grant all his pleading here (which goes but upon a begged ſuppoſition of prelacies indifferencie, and the indifferencie of the matter of the Covenant) what a flat folly is it, to tell us of *preferring greater to leſſer duties*? wheras with us the queſtion and caſe is, anent Miniſters duty when *the Magiſtrat refuſeth to admit to preach, but upon ſinfull terms*; which one conſideration makes all his tatle here evaniſh in wind. Suppoſe the Rulers of a land diſcharge all preaching, but upon the terms that Miniſters ſhould commit ſome horrid act of wickedneſs, would this man admit any to

plead as he doth for doing evill that good may come of it, and to tell what a weightie duty it is to preach the goſpel, and that the leſſer duty of forbearing that evill commanded, is overruld by the greater obligation to preach, &c. Well, he and his partie (like the phariſaik teachers, twixt whom and us he inſinuats a compariſon) are ſure blind Informers and leaders, and may be ſet to learn better (thou that teacheſt another teacheſt thou not ſelf;) For they have vented ſuch principles anent ſacred Oaths, as ſome heathens would be aſhamed of, and which baniſhes all faith out of the world. For what he adds anent the Rechabites, when he ſhal equiparat the matter of their vow, a thing meerly civil, relating to their abſtinence from wine, and the manner of their dwelling, with the weighty and great duties of a Covenant with God, for publick and perſonal reformation, and withal prove that hazart will equally plead for the laying aſide of the laſt, as in ſome caſes it may warrand a diſpenſing with ſome part of the firſt, the parallel ſhall be admitted, but till then, it muſt paſs among the reſt of the Informers *gratis dicta*. The *Dutch annot.* (on Jer. 35. 7.) Shew that *Ionadab probably put this ingadgment on his poſterity, upon his foreſight (by a prophetick ſpirit) of the judgments and deſolations to come upon Iſrael, in order to their inoffenſive walk, and for inuring them to parſimony.* And as for their dwelling at Jeruſalem in caſe of hazard they ſhew (on. 11. v.) „ that the Rechabits, „ laid aſide in this *one* thing their fathers command, be„ cauſe it was but a humane ordinance, which in obe„ dience to the law of God, they might in ſome caſes „ wave, *which was alſo Ionadabs intention, and acceptable to* „ *God.* And that in giving this account to the prophet of „ their practiſe in reference to their dwelling now at „ Jeruſalem upon the Aſſyrians invaſion, they do ſhew „ that their fathers charge, and their vow was not to be extended

„ extended to this case. So that in their sense there was no breach of the vow properly and strictly taken, but onely the laying aside of a part of a humane ordinance, in case of extreme hazart, and this according to the nature and designe of the vow it self, and the first institution therof.)

## Chap. V.

*The* Informers *answers to our Argument for the Covenant obligation, taken from* the Oath to the Gibeonites, *and* Zedikiahs Oath to the King of Babylon, *weighed. Upon the first argument after a foolish traverse about the consonancy of the Oath to the Law of God, he yeelds the cause in granting that the Oath* did oblige the first takers, and their posterity. *Upon the second he begs the question and admits its chief scope and nerves. Likewise his answer to Psalm.* 15. 4. *His reflection on the Assembly* 1638, *and his argument offered by way of retortion anent our owning of Comissaries though abjur'd in the Covenant, largly scanned.*

THus we have seen into what a fascination and labyrinth of absurd inconsistent notions this new proctor hath involved himself, while endeavouring to loose these sacred bonds of our solemn vows and Covenants with God, and that he hath run cross to the scripture, to Casuists, yea to himself, in this enterprise. We shal now proceed to examine what strength is in the remnant of his reasonings upon this head;

And

And how he acquits himself in his answers to some pregnant passages of scripture pleaded for the Covenant. The first that follows in this dialogue is that remarkable transaction of Joshua and Israel with the Gibeonites, largly and unanswerably pressed and improven by such as have written for the Covenant; which this man thought he could not for very shame passe over; but sure he had better done so, then to have made such a pitifull and superficiall return. Well, let us hear it.

The Doubter now assaults him as to this notion anent the greater good in quiting the Oath, with that instance of the Oath to the Gibeonites, [whom God had commanded to make no peace with, but enjyond Israel to root them out, to whom Josua and the Princes might have said, Gods command Looses us from our Oath, and it will hinder a greater good, yet in that particular they rather dispensed with Gods command, then with their Oath; the acceptablness wherof to God, appeard in his punishing Saul a long time after for killing these Gibeonites, to whose predecessors Joshua & the princes had suorn.] In answer to this, he runs out a great length anent that transaction, to infringe this argument. Which I shall now examine.

But before I enter upon this, I would premise two things, first, that this trifling *Informer* hath so moulded our argument from this text as quite to divert it from its true channel and scope, which is *to prove the obliging force of ane Oath or Covenant (Lawful upon the matter) both upon the takers, and their posterity, notwithstanding of many circumstantiall sinfull aberrations from the divine rule, in the manner of entring into it.* As is most evident in this instance as I shal after shew. And this man could not be ignorant, that this text is thus improven by Timorcus and Others, who have written for the Covenant, and this argument, and

improvement

improvement of the text which he preſents, is but a man of ſtraw of his own upſetting. Secondly, that we are not concerned in order to the evincing the premiſed truth for the proof wherof we adduce this text, peremptorly to determine this queſtion, *whither this Oath did contradict Gods poſitive Law, and how far any piece or circumſtances of the divine precepts anent the deſtruction of the Cannanites, making no leagues with them, juſtles with this Covenant and Oath, and are found overruled by its oblgation*: for our argument ſtands good and intire, tho we abſtract from any poſitive determination in this point. So that in tracing our Informers extravagant diſcourſe in anſwer to this objection of his own moulding, we ſhal rather diſcover the ſlippery grounds he walks upon, and the inconſiſtencies wherin he is involved by his anſwers, and confident aſſertion of the Oaths conformity to the divine Law, then poſitively to reſolve and determine any thing in this debate, which this man hath no leſs ridiculouſly handled, then impertinently brought in. But to the point.

Firſt, *he wonders that we make uſe of this argument to prove the obligation of our Oath againſt Biſhops.* But ſure it is ane argument verie Sutable, if ane Oath into which Joshua and all Iſrael were cheated, ane Oath to heathens, and which had at Leaſt-wiſe a verie apparent inconſiſtencie with Gods command, to root out theſe Canaanites, and not to pitie or ſpare them, is found ſo highly obligatorie, and even binding the poſterity, how much more the nations Covenanting with God, and with one another for publick and perſonall reformation. But he ſayes, *That we miſtake this place.* Why ſo? *Firſt, if we think Joshua was forbidden upon any termes to make a Covenant with theſe Canaanites, but to root them all out, and yet becauſe of this Oath ſpared them, then* (he ſayes) *we run in a moſt wild and groſs opi-*

nion

*nion.* Severe cenſure! why ſo, what is that opinion? *that ane Oath* (ſaith he) *can bind againſt a command of God, whither it be a morall or particular Command; its all one. So that as we ſaid before, that ane Oath can bind againſt commands of men in authority, now we go a greater length, in making them bind againſte Commands of God.* But I anſwer, firſt, that there was a command of God to cut off theſe Canaanites, without pitying or ſparing them, I hope he will not deny, and if he do, it is eaſie to be produced, Exo. 23. 32, 33. Exo. 34. 12. Deut. 7. 2. Nay more, Gods command herein was ſo peremptory, that where he appointed his people to tender peace to other cities, before they proceeded to deſtroy them, there is ane exception made (as Iackſon obſerves upon Joſhua 9. 7.) of the cities of Canaan Deut. 20. 15, 16. *thus ſhalt thou do unto all the cities which are very far off from thee, which are not of the Cities of theſe nations. But of the cities of the People which the Lord thy God hath given thee for ane inheritance, thou ſhall ſave alive nothing that breatheth.* To this place Iackſon points us to clear this matter. 2ly, Its as evident that theſe Gibeonites had their ſaftie from this Oath and Covenant. For upon this we have the judgement of all the princes of the congregation, (Josh. 9. 19.) in determining that queſtion about their ſaftie, *we have ſworn unto them by the Lord, therfor we may not touch them, becauſe of the Oath which we ſware unto them.* Yea more, when many hundered yeares after, the injury of Saul is mentioned in ſlaying them, the ground of their right to Live and dwell among the Lords people, rather then the other Canaanites, is attributed expreſly and ſolely to this Oath; 2. Sam. 21. 2. *Now the Gibeonites were not of Iſrael but of the Amorites, and the children of Iſrael had ſworn unto them, and Saul ſought to ſlay them, wherfor David ſaid what ſhall I do for yow.* Now the command being ſo expreſs to cutt them off, and upon the

the other hand, their ſaftie being firſt and laſt attributed ſo clearlie to the Oath, that which this man calls *a wilde and groſs opinion*, he muſt either impute to the Scripture-account of this matter, or reſolve and accommodat this difficulty, which he is (in maintaining the Scriptures authority) oblidged unto as well as we. 3ly, that which he calls *a wilde and groſs opinion*, is the Judgement of Learnd Divines, particularly of Jackſon, who upon the twenty vers. of that 9 of Joſhua, having moved this objection, *that what the Princes ſware was againſt the expreſs command of God, who had often enjoind to deſtroy all theſe Canaanites.* Returns this anſwer. *That though one Oath or vow doth not bind men for doing of any thing that is abſolutely unlawfull, yet in this caſe it was not ſo, becauſe the charge which God gave for ſlaying the inhabitants of the Land, was a particular command, and ſo far only to bind their conſciences, as it might be obeyed without any breach of the morall Law, as in Rahabs caſe it is alſo evident. But, here they could not obey that command of God concerning their deſtroying all the Inhabitants of Canaan, without perjurie, which is againſt the Law and light of nature*—— he adds], *that their perjurie would have given great occaſion to the enemies of Gods people to blaſpheme*—— *So that* (ſaith he) *there lay a ſtrong bond upon the conſciences of the Iſraelites, though they were deluded by the Gibeonites.* Now I think the account of this difficulty exhibit unto us here by this learnd divine, may make him aſhamed of his aſſertion in this point, & we may retort his objected abſurditie thus, if the morall Laws obligation in oppoſition to perjurie, ſtood againſt and counter-ballanced a particular command of God in this matter, much more will the force and obligation of ane Oath, in a matter of far greater importance, ſtand good againſt any poſitive Laws and ſtatutes of men. And if even Gods poſitive Particular command, could in this caſe

ground

gound no diſpenſation with their Oath, but God would rather diſpenſe with the particular command, than with it, how much more abſurd muſt he be, who pretends a diſpenſation with, and a nulling of, ſuch ſelemn Sacred Oaths and vows to God as we are under, and in ſuch weighty matters, upon the arbitrary commands of men, eſpecially men under the ſame Oaths themſelves.

In the premiſed diſtinction of Mr Jackſon, the Informer might have diſcovered the folly of his bold unreſtricted aſſertion; *no Oath can bind againſt a comand, no not a particular command.* For Jackſon diſtinguiſhes (which this man admits yea and poſitively aſſerts) betwixt that which is *ſimply and abſolutely unlawfull*, and that which is unlawful only *upon the ground of a particular poſitive precept*, which in ſome circumſtantiat caſes may come to juſtle with the abſolutly binding moral Law, as in the inſtances adduced by the Informer himſelf is evident.

4 Ly, His own rule anent *the leſſer obligation overruled by the greater or Prior*, will plead for this, and his inſtances, of *Mercie and not Sacrifice*, of Paul and thoſe with him, *their caſting the goods into the ſea*, *Davids eating the ſhew-bread to keep from ſtarving*, do confirme the anſwers above ſet down. For here particular poſitive precepts, are overruled by the greater and Prior morall obligations of the 6th Command anent ſelf Preſervation. What abſurditie then is there in this aſſertion, that the great morall precept of *Not taking Gods name in vain*, did over-rule a particular poſitive precept? Doth he not here ſee Gods great morall Commands (in the premiſed inſtances) binding againſt leſſer poſitive precepts. And when he ſaith *that whither the command be morall or particular which the Oath binds againſt, all is one as to his fancied abſurditie*, he diſcovers ignorance, and inconſiſtency with himſelf;

ſelf, for in all his formentioned inſtances, moral precepts do overrule poſitive, particular and leſſer precepts. And why ſhall not alſo the great morall command anent *not taking Gods name in vain*, overrule that poſitive and particular precept anent the ſlaying of theſe Gibeonites, and far more our ſolemn vows, the preſent ſtatutes of men. Sure, he will never be reconciled with himſelf here, or aſſigne a diſparity. Hence Iackſon having ſaid that the bond of this Oath lay ſtrongly upon the conſciences of the Iſraelites to obſerve it, though they were deluded by theſe Gibeonites, addeth *that in this the Rule holds good, I will have mercie and not Sacrifice*, and from his own argument concludes that which he here denyes. So that this caſe of the Gibeonites (according to Jackſons ſolution of this difficulty, and that ſenſe of this ſcripture followed by him and Other learned divines) ſtrongly repells his rule, from the hindrance of a greater good to looſe the Covenant, eſpecially ſince this greater good doth with him ſtill reſolve into obedience of mens Laws. Had not the Iſraelites this ground more ſtrongly to plead againſt the keeping of their Oath to theſe Gibeonits, ſince not only they were cheated into it (*and dolus auſert conſenſum* ſay Caſuiſts) but it ſeemd to hinder a farr greater good viz; the obeying of Gods expreſs command to root them out; yet Joſhua & the Princes knew not this new knack for looſing Oaths. But the interpoſing the ſacred name of God in ane Oath, was with them ſo weighty a matter, that it overruled all theſe pretences.

Thus we have ſeen how he acquits himſelf as to his firſt charge of [a miſtake of this place] and that what he calls *a groſs and wilde opinion*, is the ſenſe of the ſcripture embraced by learnd divines and conſonant to his own pleading; ſo that in this charge he diſcovers too bold ignorance. What more hath he to ſay? he tells

usly, *that we are miſtaken if we think, that Ioshua had no warrand to make peace with any of the Canaanites, but was commanded without once treating with them, to root them all out: becauſe in Deut. 20. 10. he is commanded to proclaim peace indefinitly to any citie he came to fight with, the Canaanites not excepted. Ans.* How can this man ſay that the Canaanites are not excepted, from that offer of peace there injoyned, when as he doth not ſo much as offer to anſwer to theſe pregnant circumſtances of the text, pleaded by Iackſon and Others to prove the contrary. For, after the Lord hath commanded them to proclaim peace to a city before they aſſau-
„ted it, there is (verſe 15.) *a limitation.* Thus ſhalt thou
„do unto all the cities which are very far off from thee,
„which are not of the cities of theſe nations (viz: who were devoted to deſtruction) therfor in the 16. verſ. after the Lord hath thus ridd marches, as to the Canaanites they get this precept, *But of the cities of theſe people which the Lord thy God doth give thee for ane inheritance thou ſhalt ſave alive nothing that breatheth.* Can any reſtriction and exception be more peremptory? and that we may know, who theſe are who are thus excepted from mercy, and from theſe offers of peace mentioned, the 17. ver. clears it. *But thou ſhalt utterly deſtroy them, namely the Hittites, and the Amorites, the Canaanites, and the Perizites, the Hivites and the Iebuſites, as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee.* This additional motive *of Gods command* is here remarkably inſerted; which is the more remarkable if compared with the 2. of Sam. 21. 2. *The Gibeonites were not of Iſrael but of the Amorites, and the Children of Iſrael had ſworn to them.* When the ſpirit of God, is reminding us of this ſtory in pointing at Sauls guilt, we are firſt told that they were *of the Amorites*, a people devoted to deſtruction by Gods command, but excepted from

rom the reſt that were deſtroyed, upon the ground of this Oath, and upon this ground ſolely.

Jackſon upon this paſſage, holds „ that the offer of „ peace, is not to be underſtood of any city of Ca„ naan upon theſe grounds, firſt, becauſe they were „ expreſly charged utterly to deſtroy the inhabitants „ of Canaan, to the end they might dwell in their „ room and might not be enſnard by their dwel„ ling among them; and ſecondly, we do not read „ that ever Joſhua tendered peace to any of the cities, „ tho it be mentioned as a ſtrange thing, and a ſigne „ of Gods hardning their hearts, that never any of „ thoſe people, did of their own accord crave peace, „ ſave the Gibeonites Joſh. 11. 19. — Yet we never „ find that there was peace profered them, and it „ ſeems that the Gibeontes did therefore ſeek it by „ craft, becauſe Otherwiſe they ſaw it would not be „ granted them; and 3dly, it is expreſly noted as a „ fault in the Iſraelites, Judges 1. 28. *that they put the „ Canaanites to tribute, and did not utterly drive them out.* „ Hence he concludes, that this is only to be under„ ſtood of ſuch cities as they ſhould beſiege that were „ not of the land of Canaan. And upon the 15. verſ. „ *Thus ſhalt thou do unto all the cities which are very far off „ from thee, which are not of the cities of theſe nations*, „ He adds, but theſe muſt neither have peace offered „ them, nor muſt their women and little ones and „ cattell be ſpared when their cities are taken by force; „ for the following reaſon (ſaith he) doth mani„ feſtly exclude them from both theſe favours (citing „ verſ. 18.) *That they teach you not to do after all their abominations &c.* Sure it had become this Magiſteriall *Informer* to ponder theſe reaſons ere he had obtruded upon us his bold and inconſiderate aſſertions in this point. The *Dutch Annot*: on this 15. verſ. expreſly aſſert „ that the cities of the Land of Canaan are ex-

„ cluded from offers of peace, becauſe the Lord had „ commanded them to be banned (that is devoted to „ deſtruction) as is related in the ſequel. *Mr Poole* „ upon this 10. verſ. aſſerts that this ſeems to be un- „ derſtood not of the cities of the Canaanites, as is ma- „ niſeſt from verſ. 16, 17, 18. who were under *ane abſolute „ ſentence of utter deſtruction*, Ex. 23. 32, 33. Deut 7. 1, „ 2. Whence they are blam'd that made any peace „ or league with them, Judges 2. 2. but of the cities „ either of other nations who injur'd or diſturbed „ them, or commenced war againſt them, or aided „ their enemies, or oppreſſed their freinds and allies „ or of the *Hebrews* themſelves, if they were guilty „ or abettors of Idolatry or apoſtacy from God, or of „ ſedition or rebellion againſt authority, or of giving „ protection and defence to capital offenders. Ci- „ ting Gen. 14. Judges 20. 2. Sam. 20. The En- „ gliſh annot. upon this 10. verſ. do alſo aſſert that „ this offer of peace is not to be underſtood of the ci- „ ties of Canaan, for they were to be more ſeverly „ dealt withal verſ. 16, 17. and for ſhewing them „ more favour Iſrael is blam'd Judg. 1. 28. but of ci- „ ties without the land of promiſe verſ 15. So that our Informer is here runnig croſſe to the plain ſenſe & ſcope of the text, and the current of Interpreters.

But he adds, *that there was a difference betwixt theſe Canaanites and the nations afar off in relation to this allowance of peace to them. Firſt, it was to be upon the termes of relinquiſhing their idolatry, yeelding up their Lands, and becoming ſervants. That therfor leagues with them are forbidden, they reſerving their heathniſh worſhip.* But where will he ſhew us this reſtriction, or difference in Scripture? *non eſt diſtinguendum ubi lex non diſtinguit.* We have ſeen Gods peremptory precepts to cut them off, to ſave alive none that breatheth of theſe excepted cities and nations. We find alſo peremptory com-

mands

mands to make no leagues with them, no not for civill commerce, as they might with other heathens afar off, Exo. 23. 32, 33. —— *thou ſhalt make no Covenant with them —— they ſhall not dwell in thy land*, as theſe Gibeonites were permitted; ſo Exo. 34. 12. Deut. 7. 2 we have the ſame precepts renewed. Now, where is this exception, as to theſe leagues? it lyes upon him as the affirmer to prove and inſtruct this limitation, which he here affirms, out of the text. God who gives the law muſt himſelf alſo give the exception. And this man muſt be charged with malapert intruding into what he hath not ſeen, in preſuming to put in his exceptions, unleſs he can inſtruct them, which yet he hath not done. I confeſs God who is above the Law might allow an *epiſus'a* in certain caſes, eſpecially ſuch as this anent their Oath, but looking to his own precept we find no ſuch exception from it. 2ly, he ſayes, *there was this difference betwixt them and other nations, that if they refuſed peace, they were to be worſe dealt with then any other city that was not of the Canaanites, becauſe* (Deut. 20. 16, 17.) *in caſe of their refuſal, nothing was to be ſaved alive while other cities were but to loſe the lives of the Males only. verſ.* 12, 13, 14, 15. Now, the violence which he offers here unto the text, is obvious to any that but reads it. For after that (ver. 10.) the lord hath laid down this Law in generall, anent their proclaiming peace to a city before they aſſault it, and ſhowen (in the 11. ver.) That if the city yeeld, they ſhall be tributaries — (verſ. 12, 13.) God injoyns that if the city refuſe peace, every male muſt be cut off — and (ver. 14.) the Women, little ones, and the cattel muſt be ſaved, and its ſpoile taken. Then (verſ. 15.) to ridd marches, and to ſhew whom all theſe preſcriptions relate unto, and whom not. The lord adds —— *thus ſhalt thou do unto all the cities which are very far off from*

*thee which are not of the cities of these nations.* And then (as I said) in relation to them the severe command followes (16. ver.) *but of the cities of these nations which the Lord thy God gives thee, thou shall save alive nothing that breatheth.* And that these excepted cities and people may be known they are particularly named as is above expressed. He sayes, *in the case of their refusall, nothing was to be left alive, and they were to be worse dealt with than others, who refused peace, who were to lose the males only.* Wheras the text appeares express, that the Law anent offering peace, and dealing thus according as it was accepted or refused, *did not belong to them at all*, but that they are very clearly and peremptorly excepted from it. As for his long confused parenthesis here foisted in *anent the difference betwixt the peace and a league, and that Joshua first made a league with the Gibeonites, but knowing them to be Canaanites brake it, because contrary to the command of God* (citing Josh. 9, 21, 22, 23.) *and meerly allowed them a peace.* It is flatly contradictory to the text, for (vers. 15.) it is said, he made peace with them and *made a league with them* (and this league was) *to let them live, and the Princes of the congregation sware unto them.* Lo here is the Identity of the peace and league, and the designe and contents of it [*to let them live.*] The Dutch annot. upon 15. v. [the princes of the congregation sware to them] tell us, that they ratified by Oath that which Joshua had promised them, viz. that they should remain alive. The English annot. in stating the question and difficulty concerning the contrariety of this transaction to Gods command, express it thus, *whether Joshua in making peace with them, and the Princes in confirming it by Oath, did Lawfully or not.* And speak to the Lawfulness, or unlawfulness *of both* Joyntly without any distinction, but make no exception in the least of *the league* as if distinct from *the peace* confirmed

firmed by Oath, which certainly in ſtating the queſtion they would have expreſly excluded, had they imagined any ſuch diſtinction. That Joſhua keept the peace and the league, and that this league & peace was to let them live, is accordingly ſet down in the ſame termes when the Princes ratefied it; and all along where *the peace is* mentioned, *The Oath* (and by conſequence *the league* which was therby confirmed) is propoſed as its ground. They ſmote them not becauſe they had ſworn by the Lord (18. verſ.) And (verſ. 19.) the Princes determine they muſt not touch them, becauſe they had ſworn to them. And (20. verſ.) we will let them live leſt wrath be upon us becauſe we have ſworn unto them. And (verſ. 21.) the Princes ſaid to the People let them live — as they had promiſed unto them. Lo all along the Oath is moſt conſcienciouſſly obſerved, and that as acceſſory unto, and confirming this whole tranſaction, both the peace and league, the ſcope and ſum wherof is ſtill expreſſed thus [*to let them live.*] As the text makes no diſtinction, betwixt the *peace* and *league* in this ratefication, ſo the intendment therof is never extended byond their life and ſaftie firſt or laſt. How then can this man ſay that Joſhua brake the league, ſince the termes therof were to let them live (ver. 15.) which is acknowledged by the Princes & faithfully performed. The league and peace and Oath here are ſtill one, and fall under the ſame conſideration as conſonant, or diſſonant to the command; if the peace was contrary to the command ſo was the Oath, and if the league was contrary to the command ſo was the Oath alſo. For it is moſt evident, that the text ſpeakes of the *peace* and *league indiſcriminatim* or without diſtinction in relating this tranſaction, and of the Oath as acceſſory both unto the one and the other; ſo that the Oath was unlawfull, if either the peace or league was unlawfull, and if ei-

ther was broken the Oath was broken, and Joſhua and the Princes were perjured: Whereas the text records their faithfull performance of the Oath as ratefying all that tranſaction. But it is no ſtrang thing to ſee men ſo notoriouſly blotted with perjury ſeek precedents in ſcripture Saints if they could finde them. But this inſtance will ſtand in judgement againſt them if they repent not.

Whereas he ſaith, *that Joſhua brake the league as contrary to the command of God when he knew them to be Canaanites*, giving this as a reaſon why *he allowed them a peace only*. It is ſuch a flat contradiction to the text, and to it ſelf, as none can be more plain. For according therunto Joſhua could not break this league without breaking his Oath which confirmed it, and could break neither the one nor the other, and allow them a peace. Since this peace was the import both of the league and Oath; and all that the Scripture mentions as their demand of Joſhua, was peace and their life, and nomore; and this all along Joſhua and Iſrael keept, and preciſely becauſe of the Oath. As any who reads the text may ſee. The Dutch Annotations upon Joſh. 9.15. expone that branch that relates to the Princes ſwearing thus, „that they ratified by Oath that which Joſhua had pro„miſed them, viz, that they ſhould remain alive. Wherin, as they clearly hold that the Oath was acceſſory to this whole tranſaction, ſo they make it intirely to terminate in this that they ſhould have their life. And upon 2. Sam. 21.1. Where Sauls guilt in ſlaying theſe Gibeonites is mentioned, they paraphraſe it thus, that „it was contrary to the promiſe made to them & rate„fied by Oath. Joſh. 1.15,18. And whereas we are put „in minde in the 2. ver. that [the Gibeonites were not of „Iſrael But of the Amorites] —— they paraphraſe it thus, „that they were remaining of the hea„then nations whom God had commanded to deſtroy

—and

— and the other clauſe of the verſe wherein we are put in minde [ that Iſrael had ſworn to them and Saul is ſaid to have ſought to ſlay them in his zeal ] they paraphaſe it thus, that it was „irregular fained zeal „ whereby he thought to mend what Joſhua and other „ godly Governours, according to his opinion had ne„glected or ill done, but it was directly againſt the Oath „ made by Gods name, by his ſpecial providence, for „ which thing God was now greatly provocked, as by „this pleague upon the land, & Gods anſwer appeareth. Wherein, how evidently they ſtand in oppoſition to this mans gloſſes and pleading upon this head, is obvious to the meaneſt reflection ſince onely for that Oath they charge guilt on Saul. The Engliſh annotations upon (ver. 18.) ſay, „that abſtracting from the Princes „Oath it had been cruelty to have ſlain them ſeeing *they „had violat a lawfull Covenant.* Now how this aggrees with this mans gloſs of [ Joſhuas breaking the league, as contrary to the commandment ] let any judge. Jackſon „thus ſenſes ver. 23. — „the curſe, which God had pro„nounced upon the people of this land requires that „you be cut off as well as the reſt, yet becauſe of the „Oath which we have taken this curſe ſhall be upon „you in bondage and not in death.

His next inſtance to prove his ſuppoſed limitation of Gods command to deſtroy the Canaanites is that of Rahab her being ſpared Joſh 6. 17. Which clearlie croſſes his pleading & argument here; for 1. the ſpies upon very ſtrick terms ſtate their Oath: and told Rahab not only that if ſhe ſhould make the leaſt diſcovery of their buſineſs, but likewiſe that if ſhe or her friends, even ſo much as one of them, were out of the houſe when the city was taken; this Oath ſhould not reach them, whatever ſubmiſſion ſhe had made. And 2dly, All Joshuas ground when he commands the ſpies to ſecure her and her friends, is their Oath: they are commanded to

bring out the Woman, [*as they ſware to her*] and for no other reaſon. 3ly. I pray, what ſaved her friends and her relations as well as her ſelf from this common deſtruction? Surely, they made no peace nor any ſuch ſubmiſſion as this man ſuppoſeth neceſſary to exeem them from the commanded deſtruction, nor was there any aſſurance the ſpies could have touching them, and therefore they could not be upon any other ground ſaved, but becauſe included in this Oath. Beſides, what power had theſe two men to tranſact a peace without Joſhuas advice and knowledge? the ground of their tranſacting with her, is their neceſſity, and the Womans offer of their ſaftie. Now I retort his argument here againſt him; to prove that they were ſpared upon other terms then the Oath, he adduceth this inſtance of Rahabs preſervation upon the ſubmiſſion mentioned, viz. her making and accepting of peace, and hence concludes that ſhe (and by conſequence the Gibeonites) together with her friends, were ſaved upon other terms, then meerly upon the Oath, and that abſtracting from it Iſrael was obliged to ſave them. But one might argue thus, if Rahabs friends (at leaſt) might have been Lawfully cut off upon the ground of Gods command to cut off the Canaanites who made or accepted no terms of peace, and were only ſaved by the ſpies Oath, then the Oath (according to the Informers own principles) did bind in oppoſition to a poſitive precept to cut off the Canaanites: but ſo it is, that upon the ground of this Oath only her friends wer ſpared, as this man cannot deny: *ergo*, the Oath did bind here in oppoſition to a poſitive precept. He dare not ſay that her friends were proſelyts, or did in the leaſt directly or indirectly ſubmit. Nay for any thing that the ſpies knew they might be as curſed heathens as were in all Jericho (for what was Rahab her ſelf before God extraor-

traordinarly touched her heart) and conſequently by Gods poſitive precept devoted to deſtruction with the reſt. Yet this Oath, made even to another for them, yea an Oath which had a ſeeming extortion of fear in the ſpies hazard, ſaved and exeemd them from this ſtroak & curſe, ſo that in this caſe himſelf muſt confeſs that the Oath did bind in oppoſition to the poſitive precept. And this one clear Scripture inſtance ſeemes enough to prove the point *that the Oath did overrule a particular poſitive precept*, though all that he ſayes of the Gibeonites were admitted.

He adds, *that it is evident, from Joſh. 11. 19. that if other cities in Canaan, had ſubmitted, as Gibeon, Joſhua might have ſpared them.* I anſwer; the Text ſayes that *de facto* they made no peace, and that God hardened their hearts that they might come againſt Iſrael and fall. But this will be too weak to bear the weight of his concluſion *that Joſhua might have ſpared them all.* For 1. How can this conſiſt with the plain poſitive command as to their utter off cutting (often renewed) and with Gods promiſe of giving Iſrael their inheritanee, to ſpare them all. *For the Pſalmiſt tells us, that he did drive out the heathen with his hand and planted his people, he did aſſiſt the people and caſt them out.* Pſal. 44. 2. And Pſal. 78. 54, 55. *He brought them to the border of his Sanctuary, even to this mountain which his right hand had purchaſ'd. He caſt out the Heathen alſo before them, and divided them an inheritance by line, and made the tribes of Iſrael to dwell in their tents.* Hence as they were frequently enjoyn'd to caſt them out leaſt they ſhould become a ſnare to them Exod. 23. 33. Deut. 7. 16. Ex. 34. 12. So Iſraels ſparing them when they were planted in that land is frequently reprehended as their great guiltineſs Judges 1. 27, 29, 30, 31, 33. And Judges 2. 1, 2. Upon which ground the Lord threatens as a puniſhment *that he will not drive them*

out: *But that they ſhall be thorns in their ſides.* And this threatning we find execute, and the ſame very guiltineſs preſented as the cauſe of it, viz. *That they did not deſtroy the nations concerning whom the Lord commanded them.* Pſal. 106. 34, 35. which confirmes this aſſertion; and therefore this hiſtoricall clauſe in that paſſage of Joſhua, is to be expounded in correſpondence with the plain and poſitive command, which we have already ſeen clear. 2ly. Jackſon upon that 19. ver. [there was not a city that made Peace with Iſrael &c.] tells us, *that this is added as a reaſon why the wars with the Canaanites laſted ſo long —— becauſe the Inhabitants did obſtinately ſtand out —— and attempted not to procure conditions of peace ſave only the Gibeonites ——* Which is far from coming up to his ſcope and deſigne. For it is one thing to ſay that *de facto the wars laſted long —— becauſe none offered to yeeld but Gibeon*, and another thing to ſay *that Joshua was not oblidged nor commanded to cut off any but thoſe who thus warred and reſiſted.* Which will be the more weighty, if it be conſidered in the third place, that as in the command to cut them off, no ſuch reſtriction appeares, but upon the contrary the Canaanites are excepted from mercy, ſo we do not find that Joſhua offered terms of peace (as this man alleadges he was obliged) unto any of theſe that were cut off, but aſſaulted them as thoſe whom God had devoted to be deſtroyed, in obedience to his holy, though ſevere command, As we heard Jackſon hath obſery'd. This will be more clear, (and therin the Informers adverſary might puzle him) If we ſhall again reflect upon the remarkable circumſtances of that tranſaction with the Gibionites. In the 6. ver. of that 9. of Joſhua, they propoſe the matter thus, *we are come from a far country, therefore make a League with us.* Whatever they had underſtood

ſtood of Gods command to cut off the Cananites, this ſurelie was a ſtrong argument with Joſhua. Now remark the anſwer in the 7. ver. *the men of Iſrael ſaid peradventur ye dwell among us, and how ſhall we me make a league with you.* Sure their offering terms of peace and ſubmiſſion, might have ſtopped this queſtion and demurre according to his opinion, who holds that upon their ſubmitting to terms of peace, They might have been ſpared and even incorporat among Gods people, as he tells us from Joſh. 11. 19. *that all theſe Canaanites might have been ſpared, had they thus ſubmitted* So that in his ſenſe their firſt offer was a ground of peace. Eſpecially ſince (as is obſerved by learned Interpreters from their offer in the 8. ver.) they ſought peace from Joſhua and Iſrael upon their own termes, and offered to accept any conditions propoſed by them. Which was the loweſt ſtep of ſubmiſſion. And when they further anſwer that demurr about the place of their abode with this general, *we are thy ſervants*, i.e. We offer our ſelves to thee & all that is ours, which was enough in this mans Judgement, to except them from the ſtroak threatned, and commanded to be execute upon the reſt of the Canaanites. Yet this doth not ſatisfie Joſhua, but again he particularly interrogats them upon theſe two points, *who are ye?* and next, *from whence come ye?* This their free and general conceſſion (as ſome do judge) giving Joſhua juſt cauſe to ſuſpect that they were of the curſed Canaanites whom he was to deſtroy; and then they tell him that wherin the *dolus* lay, we come from a far countrey. Now, I ſuppoſe they had anſwered to theſe two Queſtions thus, *we are Amorites, and we dwell here.* Thinks this Informer that Joſhua would have lookt on himſelf as obliged by Gods Law to tranſact with them. What needed then his peremptory Interrogations (after their declared ſubmiſſion) anent their ſtock and lineage, and the place

place of their abode? What needed the people murmur, and desire to cut them off, after the contrary of what they pretended was discovered, notwithstaning hereof? Nay thirdly, why is it, that again and again their saftie is attributed solely to the Oath, without the least hint of their submission as having any influence thereupon? *Finallie* that passage Joshua 11. 19. [no citie made peace ——— For it was of the Lord that they might have no favour] seems to import no more but this, that favour might have been shown them had they submitted, but how? Even by God the supreme lawgiver (whose mercy is over all his Works) his dispensing with his own Law, and severe positive precepts, (as in the case of the Gibeonites he did) and in what Method it seemd best unto him, but it will be hard to inferr from this a limitation of the precept it self for the reasons already given. So that all that seems to follow from this passage is, that had they submitted, God might have spared them by a speciall dispensing with his own Law, (For he will have mercie and not Sacrifice) and Joshua upon Gods appointment. But not that the Law it self did dispense with them.

As for what he adds in further confirmation of this opinion, anent Salomons imposing bond service upon the remains of these cursed Nations, and their posterity afterward, whom the children of Israel were not able to cast out (which, in ane odd phrase, he calls a kindness) and anent these Children of Solomons servants, mentioned Ezra. 2. 55, 58.] Jackson will tell him [*That it contradicts not the Law* (Deut. 7.) *anent utter smiting them, and shewing them no mercy, since, that Law may be meant of the inhabitants that were in the Land at their entring first into it, not of their posterity. Especially these who had their lives previously secured.*] Which fully cuts off his argument from this

Text

Text. And this is alſo the anſwer of Mr Poole and other learned interpreters upon this paſſage. Beſides, that the Nethinims were probably the Gibeonites iſſue, and were however all of them, by a long tract of time Proſelyts incorporat among Gods people and profeſſing the true religion, which providentiall title might abundantly ſecure their lives

The Dutch Anotations upon Joſh. 29 27. do inferr from the nature and mould of that phraſe which ſignifies [a delivering them over.] that hence it is thought they were called *Nethinims* i. e. *given and delivered over* which confirms the anſwer adduced. However the perſon who ſhould directly impugne the *Informer* as to what he maintains in this queſtion (which he hath impertinently brought in without any ground, to make ſome ſhift of anſwer) might further tell him that this being *but a practice*, cannot be pleaded *againſt a rule*, but muſt be meaſured by it, which is a principle acknowledged by all.

And here I ſhall exhibit ſome remarkable inconſiſtencies of this man with himſelf upon this point 1. he ſuppoſeth that Joſhua and the princes their Oath to the Gibeonites ſtood inviolable as to this tranſaction both now and herafter; for he ſayes (page 143.) that *Sauls ſlaying the Gibeonites moved God to wrath, becauſe it was contrary to Ioſhuas Oath made to their fathers*. Now Joſhua & the Princes Oath ratefied all the Tranſaction with them, & was acceſſory therunto as the text moſt clearly holds out, viz. both the league and the peace; yet he tells us (page 141.) *that as ſoon as Ioſhua knew them to be Cananites, he brake the league as contrary to the command of God*, and conſequently his Oath confirming it according to his doctrine as being Likewiſe contrary to the command. 2ly, In that ſame page he tells us *that no peace was to be concluded with the Canaanites, unleſs they became ſervants & renounced their heathnish idolatries, and*

*and that with the ſame proviſo leagues were diſcharged with theſe Canaanites.* Yet immediatlie after he makes a diſtinction in this point betwixt *a peace*, and *a league*, and tells us, *that Joſhua had firſt made a league with them, but when he knew them to be Canaanites, he brake it as being contrary to the command of God, and only allowed them a peace.* Now both *the peace*, and *the league*, were equally allowed and commanded upon thir termes of yeelding up their Lands, and relinquiſhing their Idolatrie, and both were equally diſcharged if they did not ſo, according to the *ſeries* of his reaſoning, as is obvious to any Reader. How then (I prav) could Joſhua break his league with them as contrary to the command of God, more then the peace, both which he holds to have been allowed them with this proviſo. 3ly. He ſayes *Joſhua and the Princes ſware nothing but what God commanded* (pag. 142.) Now the text is moſt expreſs that they ſware the league ver. 15. *and Josbua made peace with them, and made a league with them to let them live, and the princes of the congregation ſware unto them.* This league he ſayes *Joſhua brake as contrary to the command of God*, in his ſecond anſwer; yet in his 3d anſwer he tells us, *that the Oath contained in it nothing contrary to the command.* Again, he ſayes God commanded to make no peace with them, *But upon the termes of ſubmiſſion, relinquishing their idolatrie, and giving up their Lands.* To this only he reſtricts the Princes ſtipulation, as falling under the command, yet acknowledges the command will include a league alſo upon thir terms, which els where (as I ſaid) he diſtinguiſhes from the peace, which he holds was not to be allowed them even upon thir termes. And likewiſe, in his ſecond anſwer he tells us that they had peace only *upon their ſubmiſſion*, without mentioning theſe other termes. Likewiſe he ſayes

that

that on these termes he *transacted to spare Rahabs friends*, but where was this assurance as to her friends?

4ly, He acknowledges (pag. 142.) *that Gods wrath for slaying the Gibeonites was because of Ioshuas Oath, made to their fathers.* Yet page 198. he cries out upon his Doubters assertion anent ane *Oath binding the posteritie*, as a strange fancy, and tells us that Casuists say, that *Iuramentum est vinculum personale, binding these only who take it.* Now whereas this man wonders much at our argument from this text anent the Gibeonites, let any judge whether his own shattered inconsistent discourse be not rather an object of wonder.

But to proceed, his third answer to the premised argument of his Doubter, from this instance of the Gibeonites, is *that Ioshua did nothing contrary to Gods command, which was to spare them upon their submission. Ans.* (Besides what is touched anent his inconsistency with himself in this, and what we are to add, anent the impertinency of this unto the point, though granted.) I say first, that Joshua and the Princes were bound to spare them abstracting from this stipulation and Oath, is more then he hath proved, and appears contrary to the command above expressed, and the current of the context where this Oath and stipulation is set down; whether we consider Joshuas peremptorie demands and demurres anent receiving them to peace, after they had expressed their submission, or the Oath its being again and again mentioned, both in setting down the stipulation its self (ver. 15.) and the reason why they were not smitten (ver. 18.) and the Princes judicial determination (ver. 19.) as *the sole ground* of Joshuas and the Princes obligation to them, without the least hint *of any other*, which certainly might have been (and consequently if true would have been, might his impugner say) very pertinently and strongly pleaded by Joshua and the Prin-

ces, to quaſh the peoples murmuring at the ſparing of them. 2ly, I might ſay, that this ſtipulation and Oath, although croſs to a particular poſitive precept, yet notwithſtanding, as matters here ſtood circumſtantiat, was conſonant to a generall moral rule of Gods mercy, who loves it better then Sacrifice. And the ſparing of theſe Gibeonites was grounded upon this great moral precept [of the reverence due to Gods name, interpoſed by a Sacred and Solemn Oath.] Which anſwer is the verie determination of Joſhua and the Princes in this matter. His impunger might here adde that it is utterly improbable, that in the Princes determination of the queſtion [whether theſe Gibeonites were to be ſaved, and the ſtipulation with them held as valid] their ſubmiſſion would have been omitted, if they had underſtood Gods command with this limitation, which is a doubt that would much puzle this Informer to reſolve.

His 4t, Anſ. is, *that God was angry at the ſlaying of the Gibeonites, becauſe it was contrary to his command, to give them peace upon their ſubmiſſion, and unto Ioshuas Oath to their fathers, and not meerly becauſe it was contrary to the Oath.* Anſ. Joſhua and the Princes Oath is both in that 9. of Joſhua, and the 2. of Sam. 21. mentioned as the only ground of their right to their life, without the leaſt hint of any command anent their having peace upon their Submiſſion, which notwithſtanding this antiſcriptural Informer (who will be wiſe here above what is written) ſets in the firſt place, as the principal cauſe of their right. When the reaſon is rendered (2. Sam. 21.) why theſe Gibeonites had a right to live among the Iſraelites, though they were not of Iſrael, but of the Amorites, it is expreſſed thus, *the children of Iſrael had ſworn to them, and Saul ſought to ſlay them.* Again, ſince he grants that God was angry at the ſlaying of theſe Gibeonites upon the ground of Joſhua and

and the Princes Oath to their fathers, he conſequently grants that this Oath, notwitſtanding of the cheat by which Joſhua and the Princes were brought under it, was ſtill binding and did oblige the poſterity, which is the Chief point that this inſtance is adduced to prove againſt him, as we ſhall preſently ſhew. For what he adds after, it is not much noticable. The reaſons of the Engliſh annotations as touching this Oaths conſonancie to Gods Law, we are not in this point concern'd to ſcanne, ſince our argument ſtands good even upon their ſuppoſition. As for theſe who ſay, *that Joſhua and the Princes Oath, was contrary to Gods Law, and do therfore aſſert that it did not bind.* We have ſhown that as herin they are not ours, ſo in this aſſertion they clearly croſs the Scriptures, as is evident from what is above touched.

Here we ſhall again minde the Reader for a concluſion to this argument and inſtance anent the Gibeonites, that all this mans clamour, about the conſonancy or diſſonancy of this Oath to Gods Law, is out of the way, and never meets our reaſoning from this paſſage, even as its moulded by himſelf, ſo that we may without loſing our argument as to its main ſcope, grant all that he ſayes *anent the conſonancy of the Oath to the divine precept about cutting off theſe Canaanites, and that it did admit theſe reſtrictions which he ſpeaks of.* But our argument for the Covenant is here twofold 1. That this Oath and Covenant with theſe Gibeonites though its matter were of a far lower nature then our Sacred Covenants, and vows, yet did not only oblidge that, but all ſucceeding generations, And therefore much more our ſolemn ſacred vows, ſo ſolemnly and univerſally ſworn, and about the great concerns of Publick and perſonal reformation, do oblidge all the poſterity. Now this being our main Argument, he is ſo far from denying it, that he grants

it upon the matter, in asserting and yeelding unto us, *that this Oath consonant to Gods Law, did bind the posterity*; for thinkes he that we doe not suppose and hold the matter of the Covenant to be consonant to Gods Law? Why then wanders he out of the way, while pretending to answer this argument, and pleaseth himself, and leads his Reader off the way with unprofitable talk not to the purpose? The consonancy of our Oath to the Law of God, being even his own supposition in this argument. 2ly. From this instance we argue (as I said) for the binding force of the Covenant even upon the adversaries supposition anent the coaction, deceit, fear, or such like irregularities in the manner of entring unto it, (which they use to make a great clamour about) and from this text we conclude that all these will not loose the Oath, when once it is taken. Since here there was *a notable cheat* whereby Joshua and all Israel were brought under this Oath, taking away both *a rationall assent of the Judgment*, and *the free sutable election of the will*, *quia dolus aufert assensum* that is, *deceit takes away assent*, say Casuists, Yet all this did not irritat this Oath when taken. And even as himself states the objection, his Doubter alledges, that the pretence or appearance of *a greater good in breaking the Oath*, was not wanting, —— and particularly pleads, *that this Oath did bind the posterity*. Now what his roaving discourse anent *the Oaths consonancy to the Law*, sayes to all this, let any rational man judge; Since both his Doubter and he, do suppose the matter of this Oath lawfull. He knew that his stating the question aright and speaking to it, would have made the vanity of his answers appear, and therfore he started this notion *anent the Oaths binding against a precept*, that tossing it a little upon his forked pen, the unwarrie Reader might beleeve, he had return'd a full answer to this argument: Whereas he but beats the air

in

in ane airie discourse out of the way, and yeelds the cause when he hath done.

Next he sayes, *we use to plead Zedekiahs breach of Oath to the King of Babylon, which the Lord was so much displeased with.* But how, and to what scope we plead that text, he durst not set down, nor put into the mouth of his Doubter any formall argument from it; Which if rightly propounded, he knew well his cause would quickly fall before it. This man could not be ignorant how Timorcus, and others, improve this text, viz. that Zedekiah who was of the Kings seed, the son of Josiah (Ezek. 17. 13.) had ane Oath put upon him by the King of Babylon anent his, and the Kingdoms fealty and subjection to him (2 Chron 36. 13.) after he had overrunn the land, and made prisoner Jehoiachin his Brother, and keept Zedekiah himself under his power. That he could neither have the crown, nor his libertie without this Oath of fealty to the King of Babylon, which was forced upon him out of fear, and as a prisoner ——— yet for the breach hereof (Exek. 17.) he is threatned with the losse of all. *Shall he break the Covenant and be delivered ——— as I live saith the Lord surely my Oath and Covenant that he hath broken even it will I recompence upon his head. And in the midst of Babylon he shall die.* Here was ane Oath, forced upon a prisoner, and a King of Judah, and upon the matter inconsistent with Israels Laws, made that the Kingdom might be base, yet the breach of it was thus terribly revenged: Therfore much more dreadfull is the breach of our solemn vows, whose matter is of such high importance, and their end so excellent, and the power imposing so native and Lawfull &c. What sayes he to this Argument? he tells us, *that the Iews were commanded to submit to the King of Babylon* (Ier. 27. 6. &c.) *so that the breaking of the Oath was disobedience to Gods command.* But who denyes this, and what doth this ar-

guing reprove? doth not his Doubter and himself also suppose the matter of the Covenant to be consonant to Gods command. But how takes he away these nerves, and tickling points of this instance and argument for the Covenant. 1. That this Oath was forced upon him as a prisoner. 2ly, taken by Zedekiah out of fear. 3ly, had a very apparent Inconsistency with a greater good, viz. to free Gods Church and people from a heathen slavery. 4ly, was cross to many standing Laws of Israel, yet neither the force of this heathen Invader, in imposing this Oath, nor the fear and bondage of this King of Israel when he did take it, nor the apparent inconsistency of its matter with a greater good, and its certain inconsistency with the standing Laws of Israel, did loose the Oath when taken, nor exeem the breaker of it from wrath and Judgement. And all this because it was upon the matter warrantable, and allowed of God, as we hold the Covenant to be. And therfore neither force, fear, bondage, the greater apparent good in breaking it, nor the inconsistency of it with our present Laws, none of all these pretences (we say) will loose the Oath of our Covenant, the matter of it being warranted of God, and of such high importance as is said. Sure it is obvious to any that this answer of his, sayes nothing to the antecedent or consequent of this argument for the Covenant, nor touches it in the least.

The Doubter objects next [the mark of the blessed man (Psalm 15. 4. vers.) swearing to his own hurt and not changing.] In answer to which this Informer grants, *that in many things a man may swear to his hurt and not change.* This is sound, and in so far he must grant, that the Oath may hinder many goods and yet not for all that be violat. And in recompence of this concession I readily yeeld to him, *that lane Oath will not bind*

*bind to a mans hurt in every thing, as to take away his own life.* And that such ane Oath binds only to repentance, as being *iniquitatis vinculum.* But what will he say to this argument which he makes his Doubter here mutter out? Why, *when it hurts* (saith he) *those in authority and peoples soules, it will not bind.* True, but how doth the keeping of the Covenant hurt peoples soules, or these in authority? we read much in Scripture of the hurt that breach of Covenant hath brought upon both these. But how a peoples keeping Covenant with God wrongs either their soules or these in authority, we would gladly hear. Dare he say that every disobedience to the *command* of Rulers, impeaches their *authority*? or that peoples want of the means and ordinances of life, is to be imputed to Godly suffering ministers, whom for keeping Gods Covenant they have chased away from their flocks & families? As for *familie hurt*, or in relation to things of this life, ther's no question but that ane Oath in many cases will bind notwithstanding therof; Which is the Judgement of all Interpreters. But now the Doubter having spent all his arguments, hath only one poor General left, viz. *that we are tender of Oaths.* To this he answers first, by acknowledging, *that we ought to be considerate before we enter into ane Oath.* Very true, and had we all been so, there had not been so many contradictory and ungodly Oaths, standing upon record against Scotland, as this day there are. Withall he sayes, *we should be well advised before we thinke our selves discharged of an Oath.* And no doubt if he and his party had advised this better with God, with his word, with sound Casuists, and their own consciences, they had not upon such poor grounds as we have seen, first perjured themselves, and pleaded for others doing the like. *But yet* (saith he) *to think we cannot be at all discharged of an Oath, in a thing not ne-*

ceſſary, *is to be more tender then we ought to be.* True: but not to take every matter of an Oath for not neceſſary, which he may have the confidence to call ſo, but cannot prove it, and not to admit every ground of diſcharge as lawfull, which ſuch Adiaphoriſts as he may pretend, is to be no more tender then we ought to be.

But here, our Informer will reach a blow again at the Aſſembly 1638, *becauſe of their looſing Miniſters, who entred by the former Prelats, from their Oaths to them.* But where is his diſcretion and tenderneſs, who objects this as a fault of that aſſembly, and yet dare not exhibit, nor offer to ſcanne their grounds mentioned in their act, in reference to theſe engadgements? wherein, becauſe that Prelacy is condemned in the word (and conſequently *the matter of theſe Oaths,*) and likewiſe found contrary to the priviledges and reformation of this Church, to maintain which, the ſe Prelats themſelves who exacted ſuch Oaths, ſtood engadged, and ſuch like grounds, they prove them to be *Materially ſinfull, iniquitatis vincula, and from the beginning null or never obliging*, and do not pretend (as he) to looſe *from Oaths antecedently lawfull and binding.* Beſides, Prelats being removed, this Oath ſuppoſing their exiſting power and office, was *ipſo facto* null and void, as the ſouldiers military Oath to the captain upon the disbanding of the armie, and ſo its root was plucked up. *Sublata cauſa tollitur effectus. Sublato relato tollitur Correlatum.* So that he gets but a Wound to his cauſe, in kicking thus againſt the pricks.

But he tells us, *that he will come yet nearer* with an other argument, and ſo he had need, for the preceeding have never yet come near our cauſe nor his deſigne. Well what is this? *Commiſſaries* (he ſaith) *were abjured*

*ſwred in the Covenant, as officers depending upon the abjured hierarchy, yet we ownd them, before Biſhops were reſtored, and why may not he, the abjured Biſhops alſo.* But will he ſuffer a Reverend father Biſhop Lighton to anſwer for us, and ſhew him the diſparity of our Commiſſariot (a meer civil adminiſtration, influenced and authorized by ſuperiour civil Governours, as a part of the politicall conſtitution of the Kingdom) with a Church office. In his firſt letter anent the Accommodation, printed in that piece entituled, *The caſe of the accommodation examined*, he will tell him, *that though we have the name of Commiſſaries yet they excerciſe not any part of Church diſcipline.* Which he ſets down, expreſly to diſtinguiſh them from *the Commiſſaries abjur'd in the 2d Article of the Covenant.* Now, the difference of this owning our Commiſſaries in Scotland, from owning and ſwearing fealty to the Biſhop as a Church officer, in all his Spirituall uſurpations, is ſo palpable, that any may ſee the impertinency of this inſtance even in Biſhop Lightons Judgement. Moreover, we abjure in the Covenant *all Eccleſiaſtical officers depending upon that hierarchy.* But will he dare to ſay that the Commiſſary, whoſe *adminiſtration* is properly *Civil*, and when the Covenant was taken had not *the leaſt dependance upon a Prelat*, was *an Eccleſiaſtical officer depending upon that hierarchy.* Surely the meaneſt capacity may diſcover the vanity of this argument.

The Doubter objects this, [ that the Commiſſaries did not then depend upon the Biſhops, and therfore might be ownd as not contrary to the Covenant.] To this he anſwers, *that upon this ground of a non-dependance upon Biſhops, we might have ownd a Dean at that time, or a Biſhop, as having no dependance upon an Arch-biſhop; and that he cannot ſee why any member of the hierarchy under the higheſt, might not have been owned and retaind on this ground, as well as the Commiſſary. Ans.* The diſparity

is manifeſt to any of Common ſenſe; the Dean *ſua natura* is an Eccleſiaſtick officer, and the very office denotes a relation unto, and Eccleſiaſtick dependance upon a prelat, in ſpirituall adminiſtrations: ſo that Prelacie being laid aſide, and the hierarchy ſmoothed to Presbyterian Parity and Government, the Dean is a meer *Chimæra*, and ſo is the dioceſan Biſhop, and can no more ſubſiſt, the baſis and fountain of his very office *qua talis, or as ſuch*, being removed and extinct. But the Commiſſary (a civil officer and Magiſtrat) his adminiſtration, of its own nature civill, depends upon, and is regulat by, ſuperiour civil Rulers, and ſo in that caſe ſubſiſts intirely as a part of the civil Government, where prelacie is aboliſhed; and can no more be ſcrupled at, becauſe a prelat did ſomtime uſurpe an authority over that office, then the office of the Lord high Chancellour, or any other civil office of ſtate, and inferiour offices theron ſpecially depending, becauſe ſomtime a Prelat was Chancellour, and uſurped authority in theſe matters, ought to be diſowned or ſcrupled at upon this account.

2ly, He ſayes, *this anſwer comes near to what he ſaid before, anent the English divines who hold, only that complex frame to be abjured in the 2d article, which conſiſts of all the officers there enumerat. Ans.* 1. It is more then he hath proved, that the Engliſh divines do owne (even *ſigillatim* or apart,) all theſe officers, or looke upon themſelves as only obliged againſt that complex frame conſiſting of all the officers enumerat in that article. We heard before out of Timorcus (whom Biſhop Lighton in that letter, and the Informer himſelf cites, as holding that our Prelacie is conſiſtent with the Covenant, and whom they appeal unto in this debate) that they diſowne all Prelacie, where one ſingle perſon exerciſeth ſole power in ordination and Juriſdiction, all Prelacie beyond a Proeſtos, and particularly

eularly the name and thing of Arch-Biſhops, Biſhops, Deans, Chapters, Arch Deacons. Timorcus in the 7. Chap. adds, ——— „all Biſhops not Choſen by the „clergie and people ——all Biſhops who act by Deans, „prebends, and exerciſe their power by Chancellours, Commiſſaries &c. Doth not the article it ſelf abjure, *all eccleſiaſtical officers depending on that hierarchy.* So that though we did come near to what they ſay in this anſwer, we come never a whit nearer him. 2ly, we told him already that the Commiſſaries office is *properly Civil*, though uſurped upon by the Prelat, ſo that when purged from this uſurpation, and running in the channell of a meer civil adminiſtration, influenced and authorized by Superiour civil Governours, as a part of the political conſtitution of the kingdom, it falls not within the compaſs of *an Eccleſiaſtical officer depending on the hierarchy*, by his own Confeſſion, and Biſhop Lightons. How then was the owning of him before the introduction of Prelacie, contrary unto the Covenant.

But becauſe he ſuffered not his poor Doubter to tell him that the Commiſſary, beſides that in our late times, he did not depend upon the Biſhop, is really and upon the matter with us a Civil, not a Church officer, he thinks to ſurpriſe him with a third anſwer. *That now the Comiſſaries do actually depend upon the Biſhops, yet we ſcruple not, nor decline their Courts and authority, and if we decline them not (as according to our Principles we are oblidged) how are we free of perjury? and if we can acknowledge a Commiſſary notwithſtanding the Covenant, why may not he alſo a Biſhop. Ans.* What poor tatle is this? we told him already that the Commiſſariot is of it ſelf a lawfull Civil adminiſtration, not ane Eccleſiaſtical function, and the prelats uſurped authority cannot render this civill office unlawfull. Wheras the dioceſan Biſhops office, is a pretended *Eccleſiaſtical*

*juction*

*function*; and in its very nature a groſs corruption, and contrary to the word of God, as is above cleared. Which diſparity is palpable to any that will but open their eyes. Do we abjure any Civil courts or officers in that article? are they not termd expreſly *Eccleſiaſtical officers* who are there abjured: Nay, doth not Timorcus tell us that in England the Commiſſaries „ exerciſe a power in Church diſcipline „ by a delegation from the Biſhop. And doth not Biſhop Lighton deny this to be competent to our Commiſſaries here. For in that paſſage of the letter now cited, he ſayes we have nothing but *the name of Commiſſaries*, he means in reſpect of theſe in England, who exerciſe eccleſiaſtical diſcipline under the Biſhops. Didoclavius pag. 458. Cites *Cowellus in Interprete*, about the office of the Biſhops Commiſſary in England, ſpeaking thus, *Commiſſarij vox Titulus eſt Eccleſiaſticæ Jurisdictionis (ſaltem quouſque commiſſio permittit) in partibus Dioceſios a primaria Civitate tam Longe diſſitis ut Cancellarius ſubditos ad principale conſiſtorium Epiſcopi citare non poteſt &c.* „ That is, that *Commiſſary* „ in England is a title of Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction ſo „ faras his commiſſion will allow in places which are ſo „ far remote from the cheif city of the dioceſs, that the „ Chancellour without great moleſtation cannot cite „ them to the Biſhops cheif court. Didoclavius tells us (*ubi ſupra*) that according to the Statutes of England, the Chancellour is the Biſhops principal officiall, & the Commiſſary the Biſhops foraneous officiall.

To conclude, 1. The Biſhops power as to Civills, and their deputation of this their power to Chancellours is a moſt groſs uſurpation, Contrary to the Scripture, which forbids the Miniſter to entangle himſelf with things of this life. Our Lord himſelf would not ſo much as be an arbiter in a civil Cauſe. Paul ſpeaking of the miniſterial duties, ſaith who

who is sufficient for these things. The Apostles must Give themselves continually to the Word. Cartwright against the Rhemists upon 2. of Tim. 2. 4. Proves that pure antiquitie Knew nothing of prelats thus medling, citing Jerome (super Sophon. cap. 1.) who expounds that place against Ministers medling in Secular affaires. And Cyprian, who applies this place against one who took upon him to be executor of a Testament: *Lib. 1. Epist. 9. consil. Carthag. 4. Cap. 20. Apostol. can.* (*Can. 6.*) *Seculares Curas non Suscipite.* Likewise Ambrose, who affirmes that *Worldly Goverment is the weakning of the priest.* (Lib. 5. Epist. 33.) Smectimnuus (pag. 32. Sect. 10.) cites concil. Hispall. 2. Cyprian Epist. 28. against this deputation of prelats power to Chancellours, Commissaries &c. and Brings in Bishop Dounham aknowledging (Defens. Lib. 1.) that in „ Ambrose time and a good while after, which was „ about the year 400. till presbyters were wholly „ neglected, the Bishops had no ordinaries, vicars, „ Chancellours, Commissaries, that were not Clergie „ men. But this restriction they affirme to be a meer blind, and Challeng him to shew any such under-officers of Bishops in those times. So that they hold this to be one main point of difference betwixt their Bishops, and the primitive Bishops. 2dly, in England, not only hath the Commissary a Civil administration under the Bishop, but hath Likewise power of Spiritual censures, and a great part of the Bishops ecclesiastical administration, committed unto him both over Ministers and others; such as suspension, deposition, excommunication: See Didoclav. (pag. 464, 465. de officialibus) Cartwright (2. repl. part. 2. pag. 69.) who shews „ that the prelats not only „ exercise Tyrrany themselves over the Church, but „ bring it under subjection to their very Servants, „ yea their Servants Servants such as Chancellours, Com-

„ Commiſſaries &c. 3ly, it is clear that ſince the reformation we never had in Scotland ſuch Commiſſaries; but our Law and practice ſince that time, and ſince Popiſh Prelacies were diſſolved, hath much reduced them to the ſtate & Quality of other civil officers, whoſe adminiſtration of its own nature depends upon ſuperiour civil officers. For this we have (as I ſaid) Biſhop Lightons own Confeſſion, *that we have but the name of Commiſſaries* here, *who have nothing to do with Church diſcipline*; Only their civil power is invaded again by the Prelats. 4ly, B Lighton and this Informer do both plead, „ that its only the officers enumerat in the 2d „ Article of the Covenant, and the Commiſſaries as „ then moulded & Exiſtent in the Church of England, „ that this Oath obliges againſt. And ſo *according to their Principles and pleading*, our Commiſſary here, ſo vaſtly diſcrepant from theirs, falls not within the compaſs of the Covenant abjuration. Hence finally, the owning of the Commiſſary in his Lawfull civil adminiſtrations, can be no acknowledgement, either 1. of the Engliſh Commiſſaries Power, which he hath not. Nor 2dly, of the Prelats uſurpation upon this civil office; no more then the ſimple uſing of our civil Laws, and the ordinary civil courts during Cromwells uſurpation, was a homologating the wickedneſs therof, which this man will not dare to aſſert. An uſurper may be *in titulo*, and ſuch ſubmiſſion and improvement of the civil power invaded by him, as doth acknowledge *the providentiall Title*, and his being poſſeſſed of the power *de facto*, and having as they uſe to ſay *jus in re*, or actual providential poſſeſſion therof, If there be no active concurrance towards his Eſtabliſhment, is, as to civills, free of any guilt of the uſurpation, and will import no acknowledgement of the uſurper his Pretended *jus*. Which is the Judgement of all ſound divines and Caſuiſts.

But

But the caſe is far different as to our Informers deriving his deputed Eccleſiaſtical Miniſtery or ſpiritual authority from the Biſhop; becauſe, 1. the Prelats office it ſelf is a groſs uſurpation, contrary to the Scripture, ſo is not the Commiſſaries office. 2dly, the Pelats uſurped poſſeſſion of unlawfull power over the Church, which is Chriſts Kingdom, cannot give him ſo much as *a providentiall Title*; and therfore all acknowledgement therof is unlawfull. Thirdly, his ſubmiſſion to prelacy as now it ſtands Circumſtantiat, is an acknowledgement both of the *poſſeſſion*, and *jus*, which this man will not deny, and this is far diſtinct, from an act which doth but indirectly acknowledge the *uſurpers poſſeſſion*. So that his Conformity is ane expreſs acknowledgement and owning of a groſs encroachment upon Chriſts Kingdom (his Church) which is *toto Cœlo* different, from acknowledging a poſſeſſion *de facto* of, and *a Providential title* unto, a part of the civil adminiſtration of the Kingdoms of the world, which are mutable. And as for a teſtimony againſt this uſurpation, I ſuppoſe that had the people of God diſowned theſe civil courts, upon this ground of the Covenant obligation, his party, for the preceeding reaſons, had ſignally cried out againſt it, as an AnaBaptiſtical rejecting of Lawfull civil Goverment, more then he doth upon this Pretence, alledge a homologating of Prelacie, in this acknowledgement. But however, we ſay, that the people of God [their notour and ſtanding teſtimony againſt Prelacie it ſelf as now Eſtabliſhed, doth ſufficiently reach this among other its uſurpations, although this piece of civil Government be *eatenus* or in its own nature and as ſuch, owned as formerly.

But now our Informer charges us with another breach of Covenant, upon the ground of *ſchiſme*, which

which he ſayes, *we are carrying on in oppoſition to the peace and liberty of this Church, which Chriſt has bequeathed to her in legacie.* This heavy charge we would gladly know how he will inſtruct, and becauſe he cannot ſtay to diſcuſs that point in this dialogue, we will therfor ſuperſed our enquiry here, and paſs over to his *third dialogue*, and Examine therin the grounds of this accuſation, which we doubt not to diſcover, to be as Irrational, as theſe examined in the preceeding Dialogues.

A
Confutation
*Of the Third*
# DIALOGUE,
Upon the point
*Of*
# SEPARATION.

*Wherein upon exhibiting the true ſtate of the Queſtion, the practiſe of adhering to Presbyterian Miniſters in the exerciſe of their Miniſtry, and denying of a ſubjection to Conformiſts as the lawful Paſtours of this Church, from vvhom Gods people are bound to receive the ordinances, is vindicat from the charge of* a ſinfull Schiſmatick ſeparation, *the true and ſolid grounds of this practiſe offered, and the Informers arguments againſt it, fully anſvver'd.*

## CHAP. I.

*The queſtion ſtated and cleard, from our Churches ſtate before, and ſince the introduction of Prelacy, the different condition of Presbyterian Miniſters and Conformiſts: Separation in many caſes not Schiſme. The Informers groundleſs ſuppoſitions. Arguments preſented and proſecuted at ſome length, whereby this practiſe is acquit of the charge of a ſinfull ſeparation, and diſcovered to fall under Scripture precepts and obligations as duty.*

THE ſtate of the Queſtion *in the third Dialogue*, is anent *ſinfull ſeparation and Schiſm; whether the people of God be guilty of it in adhering to ſuch Miniſters as contend for our Reformation, rather then Curats or Conformiſts; And whether they ſtand in this caſe of our Church) oblig'd to adhere to the one or the other, as their true Paſtours, from whom they are to receive the goſpel ordinances, and to whom they owe ſubjection, reverence, and obedience accordingly.* This ſtate of the Queſtion our Informer cannot in the leaſt pick a quarrel at, it being moſt ſuitable unto his pleading, which is all along grounded upon this ſuppoſition, *that conformiſts do ſtand in a Miniſterial relation to this Church, and profeſſours therein*: from which he concluds peoples obligation to adhere unto them, *as their only true, and proper Paſtours*. And in correſpondence to this principle and inference, doth univerſally and abſolutely faſten the charge *of intruſion* and *Schiſm* upon Presbyterian Miniſters

ſters, and people, as to their *reſpective acts of preaching*, and *hearing* in their preſent ſtate and circumſtances So that if we can overturn this his grand topick, & fortify the antitheſis therof, he muſt grant that all his reaſoning in this Dialogue falls to the ground. For clearing this let us take a litle view, firſt, of our Church of Scotland her caſe at Prelacies introduction. 2ly, of her preſent caſe. 3dly, of the different grounds which the Presbyterian and Prelatick partie plead upon, for the peoples adherence. 4thly, on whoſe ſide the ſeparation ſtands. Schiſm is a *ſinfull ſeparation from a Church, with whom, & in what acts we are bound to adhere*. So that when this Queſtion is cleared, who are that Church to which we ſtand under obligations to adhere, it will go far to clear this debate.

Firſt, As to the ſtate of our Church at Prelacies Introduction, I ſhall l y down theſe three ſuppoſitions in relation to the matter of fact. Firſt, that our Church from the infancie of her Reformation, together with *popry* rejected *Prelacy*, and in her National capacitie, and in her ſupreme Judicatories diſowned it as contrary to the Word of God, as a piece of Antichriſts wicked Hierarchy: And in her National capacitie abjured the ſame often, ſolemnly, and univerſally. This hath been already clear'd upon the preceeding Dialogue. 2ly. Presbyterian Government hath been look't on by our Church, as *the only Government of the Church appointed by Chriſt* in Scripture, and as the hedge of her reformed Doctrine. Nay the owning of it hath been the great badge and *Criterion*, to try her true members; the ſubſcribing the books of Diſcipline, and the nationall Covenant of old, and the ſolemn league of late, with engadgements of adherence to Presbyterian Government, have been the ordinary door of entry

into her Miniſtry. This, as to mater of fact, is clear and undeniable. 3ly, Our Church hath Judicially condemned Eraſtianiſme, and Miniſters their ſtate offices, and appointed Judicially the cenſuring of the oppoſers of this her eſtabliſhment as ſcandalows, *Aſſembly* 38. Seſs. 16: 17. Confirmed and renewed in Aſſembly 39. So *Aſſembly* 40. *Seſs* 5.

*In the 2d place*, as to our Church her preſent condition, theſe thiugs are clear and undeniable. 1. That all the legall right of the late work of Reformation is removed in the *act reſciſſory*. 2. Presbyterian Government is raz'd, and the Church-Government monopliz'd in the Arch-Biſhops and Biſhops, obtruded upon this Church: And the right and liberties of Presbyters and all our former Church-Judicatories is removed and taken away. 3ly, Ane arbitary and Eraſtian Prelacy is ſet up in oppoſition, both unto our Churches *intrinſick power of Government*, and likewiſe her particular frame *of Presbyterian Government*. 4. All her vowes and great Oaths both in the National Covenant, as explaind An. 1638. And in the ſolemn League againſt Prelacie, and for maintaining her reformation, are diſown'd, raz'd, and caſſat, as far as legall enactings can reach. 5. Ane expreſs bad eis appointed as to both Miniſters and people their owning this courſe of defection, and diſowning the late reformation viz. *miniſters ſubmitting to Eraſtianiſm and Prelacy, and owning their new courts; and peoples hearing their vicars and ſubſtitutes*, for the ſame ſcope in the rulers diclaird deſigne. 6. Miniſters betwixt three and four hundred diſown, and ſtand in oppoſition to this courſe, and a great part and body of the profeſſours of this Church have likewiſe diſownd the ſame, & ſtood their ground. Hence upon what is ſaid, it followes in the 7th place, that ane ax is laid to the root of her reform'd Doctrine,

Worſhip

Worſhip and Government; The great hedge thereof is removed, viz: her ſolemn vows: and beſide, her *doctrinall principles* anent the Antichriſt and his Hierarchy, the Churches intrinſick power of Government, Chriſtian libertie, the unlawfulneſs of ſignificant ceremonies in Gods Worſhip; her Doctrine anent Juſtification, the Imperfection of obedience, Chriſts certain, determinat, and full ſatisfaction for ſinners, in oppoſition to the Socinian and Arminian errors; The morality of the Sabbath &c. are oppoſed by this innovating prelatick partie. And next, for *her Worship* (beſide what corruptions are already introduced, and others pleaded for, as *the perth Articles &c.*) It is, upon the matter, ſubjected to mens arbitrary impoſitions; And our National Covenant and Confeſſion is diſownd, *ae ſtricking againſt popish corruptions*, and alſo our late confeſſion as aſſerting the above-mentioned Doctrine & principles. And for Government, the Curats are meer ſlaves of Prelats, in all their meetings by his negative voice, and the Prelats themſelves are but the Magiſtrats creatures. And thus as our late couſeſſion is diſownd in relation to ſeveral doctrinal points of Chriſtian libertie, moralitie of the Sabath, free election, &c ſo likewiſe in relation to its principles as to Church Gobernment, and Chriſts appointing Officers, lawes, and cenſures, as head of his Church, his not giving the keys to the civill Magiſtrat &c. Wherein our prelatick party are come ſo great a length that the late theſes from St Andrews an. 81, daines that Aſſembly of Divines whoſe confeſſion is authorirized by the generall Aſſembly of this Church, with no other name then that of a *conventicle*. 8ly, Our Churches caſe is now worſe then when prelacy was introduced by King James. The Limitations of Eraſtianiſm by the Act of Parliament An, 1592. in relation to

*her priviledges concerning heads of religion, hereſy, excommunication, and cenſures, clear this.* Next, Church-Judicatories were not diſcontinued, but ſat upon their old ground; and Prelats were reſtored by Parliament to their *civil dignities* only. Hence 9ly. Its clear that this pure Presbyterian Church hath been *meerly paſſive* as to all theſe innovations lately introduced; her true repreſentatives or lawfull Aſſemblies never having conſented to this courſe of conformity, as appears by the Aſſembly 38. Their act anent theſe meetings, at Linlithgow 1606: at Glaſgow 1610. at Aberdeen 1616. At St Andrews 1617. at Perth 1618. Which conſented to Prelacie; All which meetings they demonſtrat to be contrary in their frame and conſtitution, to the priviledges of this Church. And at prelacies late erection Presbyterian Judicatories and Synods were preparing *a judicial Teſtimonie*, before they were raiſd. So that the voice of our lawful Aſſemblies is ſtill heard in oppoſition to this courſe; & ſince Prelacies erection we have never had ſo much as a ſhadow of ane Aſſembly &c.

For the 3d point, viz. *the different grounds which the Presbyterian and prelatick party* (and this man particularly) *do plead upon, for the peoples adherence*; take it ſhortly thus, the prelatiſts do plead firſt, that they are Miniſters, and in that relation to this Church. 2ly. That corruptions in adminiſtrators will not (according to our own principles) warrand ſeparation from ordinances. 3ly, they plead *order*, and *union*, which (they allege) is broken by peoples withdrawing. Theſe are the cheif topicks they inſiſt on. On the other hand Presbyterian Miniſters plead for diſowning them according to the forementioned ſtate of the queſtion, firſt, from this that the body of Presbyterian Miniſters & profeſſours adhering to our Churches reformation, principles, and priviledges, are

are the pure genuine Church of Scotland, tho now fled into a wilderness; whose voice we are called to hear as her true Children. 2ly, that this course of conformity is a meer intrusion on this Church, and invasion of Christs Kingdome, prerogatives and ordinances, subjecting the lawes, officers and censures of his Church unto men, exauctorating & putting in officers without his warrand; that Prelats, and their deputes consequently, have no right to officiat as Ministers in this Church. Since both the one and the other are arrand intruders upon the same, and promoters of this Schismatick destroying course of defection. 3ly, that our *Churckes divine right* and claim to her priviledges stands fast, notwithstanding the present encroachments and invasions thereof; and her Childrens obligation of adherence to the same accordingly. 4ly, That hence it followes, because of the nature and tendency of this course of defection, that all are obliged to keep themselves free from the least accession to it, and therefore to disown Curats, both as maintaining principles contrary to the principles and doctrine of this Church, and as standing in a stated opposition to her, & likewise as the objects of her censure, if she were in capacity to draw her sword. That the people of God have both *corrupt doctrine* to lay to their charge, beside the *corruption Worship*; and also their going out from the fellowship of this Church, and leading the people away from our vowed reformation &c.

In the 4th place, to come to clear ths great point *on whose side the separation stands*, let us premise these things. 1. Every separation is not sinfull, even from a Church which hath the essentialls, yea and more then the essentialls, a man may go from one Church to another without hazard of separation. But further, in these cases separation is not schism. 1. It if be from those (tho Never so many) who are

drawing back, and in ſo far as drawing back, from whatever peice of duty and integrity is attaind. For this is ſtill tobe held faſt, according to manyſcripture comands, as we ſhall ſhew. So Elias when Gods Covenant was forſaken, was as another Athanaſius; (I, *and* I *only am left*) in point of tenacious integrity. 2ly, if we ſeparat in that which a Nationall Church hath commanded us as her members to diſown by her ſtanding acts, and authority, while thoſe from whom we ſeparat own that corruption. 4. If Miniſters their ſuppoſed ſeparation be ane officiating as they can have acceſs, after a National Churches reformation is overturnd, and they perſecute from their watchtowers by theſe overturners. For in this caſe the perſecuters ſeparat from them, and chaſe them away. 4. There is a Lawfull forbearance of union and complyance with notoious backſliders, in that which is of it ſelf ſinfull, or inductive to it, which is far from ſeparation ſtrictly taken; The commands *of abſtaining from every appearance of evill*, and *hating the garment ſpotted with the flesh*, do clearly include this. 5. Many things will warrand ſeparation from ſuch a particular Miniſter or congregation, which will not warrand ſeparation from the Church National; nor infer it, by Mr Durhams acknowledgment (*on ſcandal* pag. 129.) For *if ſcandals become exceſſive*, he allowes *to depart to another congregation*. 6. There is a commanded withdrawing from perſons and ſocieties even in worſhip; the precepts, *to avoid them that cauſe diviſions and offences contrary to the received Doctrine*, Rom. 16. 17. *to come out from among the unclean & be ſeparat*. 2 Cor. 6. 17 *to ceaſe from inſtruction that cauſes to erre from the words of knowledge*. Prev. 19. 27. *to ſave our ſelves from the untoward generation*. Act. 2. 40, will clearly import this by conſequence. 2dly, This charge *of ſinfull ſeparation* which they put on Gods people ſuppoſes many things which

must

must be proved, as first, that the Prelats and their adherents, are the only true organick Church of Scotland, which is denyed; her frame and constitution being such as it said; surely the Ministers and professours adhering to her reformation must be the true Church of Scotland tho the lesser number, as they should have been, *if this prelatick defection had been intirely popish.* These souldiers who keep the Generals orders are the true army, not the deserters of the same. Either the Church in this Nation as lately reformd & constitute, and to whose constitution many Conformists vowed adherence, was not the true organick protestant Church of Scotland, or this partie, whose constitution, Principles, Doctrine & practice, are point blank contrary therunto, is not. 2. It supposed that there is *no lawfull use of ordinances among Presbyterian Ministers*, as persons who have no Lawfull call to officiat in this case. Hence this man pleads for disowning them *universally* and *absolutely*; but we affirm they are Ministers standing in that relation to this Church, and under the obligation of Christs comand to officiat, which Conformists have not yet disproved. 4. He supposes that every thing which may be expedient as to the ἐυτάξις and order of a Church, when enjoyning her *full peacable constitution*, will equally oblidge *in her broken and persecute condition*, when a prevailing backsliding party is in her bosome. Now; scripture and reasen will disprove this: circumstances of order must give place to important duties in extreme necessity as this is: the scattered officers of the Church of Jerusalem, went every where preaching the gospel (Act. 8,) so did Ministers in the beginning of the Reformation. 4. It is supposed that *our change is only as to government, and such only as was in King James time*, both which we have shown to be false. 5. He takes for granted that their *personal faults* who are conformists,

and

and a ſuppoſed *pullution of the worship* therby, is our ground of non-union; and that our granting them to have *the eſſence of a Miniſteriall call*, and that *their ſcandals will not pollute the worship*, will infer the hearing of them in this our caſe, which is alſo falſe. For even upon this ſuppoſition, we are not bound to owne them no more then ane *ingraind Schiſmatick*, obtruded forciblybya partyof the congregation upon the reſt of the people, might be ownd on this ground. 6 This man begs the queſtion in ſuppoſing that the conſtitution and frame of the Prelacy now eſtabliſh't, is *the ſame with that of the ancient Church*, for he often tels us that we would have ſeparat from the ancient Church, upon the ſame grounds for which we diſown Conformiſts. Whereas we have ſhewed the difference of our prelacy from theirs in many points. That our prelats both *as Dioceſian & Eraſtian*, are wholly discrepant from the ancient Biſhops. 7. He takes it for granted, that Miniſters who diſown this courſe of backſliding *their relation to their flocks is cut off*, in the preſent poſture of our Church, and that the Prelats and their ſubſtituts, (the Curats) are the onely proper repreſentative Church of Scotland, who accordingly have onely the lawfull power and exerciſe of the keyes as to either admiſſion or cenſure of Miniſters. A principle alwayes diſowned by our Church. See *Proteſters no ſubverters* (pag. 96.) *Rutherfoords due right of Presbyt.* [pag. 430. 431.] *Altare Damaſc.* (pag. 23.) 8. He ſuppoſes *that its unlawfull in this our caſe to officiat, renitente Magiſtratu*; that this very violence and the preſent Lawes will render Miniſters officiating unwarrantable [pag. 205.] which is a great miſtake, for the Magiſtrat cannot looſe from the paſtoral relation which he gave not, *ejuſdem eſt conſtituere & deſtituere. Ames. medull.* [cap. 30. theſ. 14. And hence *the Miniſters rela-*

tion

*tion* to the Church Nationall ſtands, tho he reſtrain *the exerciſe* thereof in any one place; and conſequently the tyes and *commands to officiat*; ſo that diſobeying the Magiſtrats *command not to officiat*, is no diſobedience to his lawful authority. Nay Apollonius thinks that the divine relation of a Miniſter to this Church, tho baniſht from his native country, doth ſtand. *Jus Majeſtatis circa ſacra part.* 1. *pag.* 331. (9.) He ſtill ſuppoſes that, what will not *ex ſe*, *or of it ſelf plead for diſowning the hearing of the goſpel, or of a Miniſter ſimpliciter*, will plead nothing in this our caſe *for diſowning Conformiſts*. The mans weakneſs, perſonal faults, not lecturing &c. are not of themſelves ſufficient to cut us off from hearing abſolutely. But tho this be granted, we have the pure genuine Church of Scotland, and her faithful Miniſtry to adhere unto, and over and above theſe grounds mentiond, conformiſts *ſchiſmatick practice*, *and corrupt Doctrine* to lay to their charge, which will make this ground in our caſe very weighty and preponderating; and this the Informer himſelf muſt grant, for he will not ſay that ſuch like pretences or arguments in our caſe, were valid as to the owning of Nonconformiſts and deſerting of Curats. Moreover he will grant, that Presbyterian Miniſters might Lawfully be heard, if Conformiſts were not ſtanding in their way. Now ſo the caſe is in relation to Presbyterian Miniſters pleading; for that none of theſe things which he mentions were valid to infer peoples diſowning of Conformiſts, were there no other Miniſters in Scotland, and if this Church had univerſally, both Miniſters and people faln into this courſe of backſliding, will be readily granted; But without any advantage to his cauſe, as is evident. To theſe many diſcoveries of his *begging the queſtion* in this debate, our plea and arguments will be clearer if we add a ſhort view of our ſuppoſitions in this caſe

and

and queſtion. Such as 1. our principle of the unlawfulneſs of prelacie. 2. The binding force of our covenants. 3. Our Churches divine right to her Reformation and priviledges once eſtabliſht. 4. that this is a caſe both of defection, and perſecution. 5. of competition betwixt Miniſters & profeſſours contending for our Reformation, and a party of backſliders overturning it. 6. The tendency of this courſe of Prelatick defection, to raze our Reformation; and that if not prevented, it will end in propery. 7. That Presbyterian Miniſters relation to this Church, and their obligation to duty founded upon that relation, is not extinguiſhed but ſubſiſts notwithſtanding of the preſent violence and perſecution, which they with their weeping mother are expoſed unto. Having premiſed theſe things, from what is ſaid we may draw forth at length the great ſtate of the queſtion thus, *whether, when the Reformation of a National Church in Doctrine, worship, diſcipline and government, is by a backſliding party overturnd, and a courſe carryed on to raze it, God having left a conſiderable body of Miniſters & profeſſours, who ſtand in oppoſition to that courſe, and are in their capacities teſtifying againſt it, are theſe Miniſters and profeſſors who preach and hear in oppoſition to that courſe, or the complying Miniſtry and hearers, the ſciſmaticks?* This being clearly the ſtate of this queſtion, we ſhall offer theſe arguments to fortifie our principle of diſowning conformiſts in this our caſe, and denying a ſubjection to them as the Miniſters of this Church, and adherence to Presbyterian Miniſters in the exerciſe of their Miniſtry, and acquit this principle and practiſe from the Informers charge of ſinfull ſeparation.

1. Whoever of the two partiss adhere unto the true genuine Church, owning her conſtitutions, authoritie and priviledges, its certain the contrary party muſt be the ſchiſmaticks; here it muſt be ſeen who are the

firſt

firſt departers, who have firſt broken the hedge, who have firſt diſownd and oppoſed the Covenants, the Government, the ſound and pure doctrine of this Church, in complyance with perſecuters, ſurely they and they only are the ſchiſmaticks. Had not this invaſion been made upon our Church and her priviledges, what would have been her Judgement of the preſent principles and practices of Conformiſts in any of her Lawfull courts? would they not have been judged cenſurable as the worſt of Schiſmaticks? Now, what is the difference here, except, that this party makes *the greater number*; but will this take away the charge of ſchiſm? ſuppoſe a party of notorious ſchiſmaticks ſhould cry our upon ſuch as withdraw from them as ſchiſmaticks, were not this a ridiculous charge; and Juſt ſo is that of Conformiſts in this caſe.

2. Every ſchiſm ſuppoſes ane obligation of adherence to that Church from which the ſeparation is made. Now then, let him prove *miniſters obligation to joyn into this Prelatick courſe* (without which they will not admit them to officiat) and diſprove *our prior obligations to oppoſe it*; or elſe Miniſters obligation to preach, and peoples conſequently to hear in oppoſition to this courſe of defection, will ſtand good on the old grounds, and all the ſcripture comands (founded on Paſtours of this Church their Miniſterial relation) to ſet the trumpet to their mouth, and give a Miniſterial teſtimony againſt this defection, and peoples obligation to hear and take warning, will preſs and plead for that which he calls ſchiſm and a ſinfull ſeparation.

3. Hence Presbyterian Miniſters, and profeſſors are in this their practiſe never toched, by all his arguments and defences, but theſe are weapons in their hands againſt him and the conforming party. 1. Whereas he pleads *the eſſence of the miniſteriall call*, which confor-

conformiſts lay claim unto, Presbyterian Miniſters anſwer, that *Nonconforming Miniſters have this*, that they are Miniſters of this Church, and have a better right to officiat as her true paſtours then Prelatiſts. And if this will not plead for hearing Non-conformiſts, why ſhall this argument be thought valide for hearing Curats? is not the ſame way from *Athens* to *Thebes*, and from *Thebes* to *Athens*? if his conceſſion touching *the eſſence of their Miniſterial* call, will not (with him) infer *hearing Non-conformiſts*, becauſe of their *ſuppoſed ſchiſm*: Ergo *a fortiori* it will not infer *the hearing of Curats*, who *really are ſuch*. 2. he pleads that *corruptions*, *and failings in adminiſtrators*, or *even ſome corruptions in ordinances*, will not infer *diſowning of Miniſters*. Why then pleads he for *diſowning Presbyterian Miniſters* and *ordinances adminiſtred by them*, to whom this is ſo clarly applicable. 3ly, he pleads *union*. But let him ſay, what was the order and union of this Church before theſe innovations? was it *ane union under Prelacie*, *Eraſtianiſm*, *and perjurious breach of Covenant*; was not our Churches Reformation in doctrine, worſhip, diſcipline and Goverment, a beautiful order and union? Now who broke this? ſuppoſe we ſhould Plead *union*, againſt his withdrawing Presbyterian profeſſours from Presbyterian Miniſters, will he owne this pleading? or not rather diſowne it, becauſe he thinks *our union is ſchiſmatical*; well, ſo we hold and do prove *the prelatick union* to be: & therefore untill he diſprove our charge againſt his party, this pleading is null.

4. Divines, do tell us (particularly Timorcus chap. 7. page 32.) „that a ſinfull ſeparation which „falls within the compaſs of ſchiſm, is *from the com-*„*munion of a Church as walking according to the divine rules*; „otherwiſe, if the Churches deviation ſpecially be „great, there is no fear of any guilt by ſchiſm in departing

"ting from it; and hence infers, that unleſs abſolvers "can inſtruct that prelacy is *juris divini*, diſowning "and abjuring it cannot be ſchiſmatical. Moreover this man himſelf grants, that ſchiſm in its ordinary acceptation, *is taken for a cauſleſs ſeparating*, and that *where communion with a Church cannot be held without ſin, in that caſe ſeparation is neceſſary*. Now then if we can prove, *that our non union is not cauſleſs*, and that *communion cannot be held with Conformiſts* (*in our caſe and circumſtances*) *without ſin*, we are not Schiſmaticks by his own confeſſion. To clear then this great point of the ſinfulneſs of owning them in their demanded conformity; we offer theſe conſiderations. 1. Owning them and ſubjecting our ſelves to their Miniſtry as the Paſtours of this Church, hath a *palpable breach of Covenant in it* as the caſe now ſtands, for all along we muſt ſuppoſe its binding force, and that there is a conſiderable body of Miniſters & profeſſours contending for it, and that the queſtion is, to which of the parties contending we are bound to adhere, and that according to our principles anent its binding force, and the unlawfulneſs of Prelacie, which this man cannot diſprove. The owning of them in the manner above expreſſed is a breach of Covenant many waves. ſpecially as this man pleads for it, with a totall diſowning of Presbyterian Miniſters in their Miniſtry. In this caſe it is a *refiling from what we have attain'd in point of reformation*, contrary to the firſt article, wherein we are bound to maintain purity of worſhip and Doctrine as then eſtabliſht. Now their preaching is for the moſt part conſiſting of *corrupt doctrine* contrary to our Reformation? And their prayers have ſeverall petitions with which we cannot joyn, ſuch as for proſpering Prelats and their courſes; Not to ſpeak of the abrogating the lecture, repeating of the creed at baptiſm, ſinging a ſet forme of concluſion, or what innovati-

ons

ons in worſhip are introduced. Again, this is a concurrence with promoters of this courſe of backſliding, and a *ſuffering our ſelves to be withdrawen from our union* engadged unto, and a denyall of ſuteable *aſſiſtance to faithfull Miniſters contending for the Covenant* againſt backſliders, all which are contrary to the other articles thereof. This will be ſpecially clear, if it be further conſidered. That 1. The body of presbyterian Miniſters being ejected, if diſown'd in the manner and extent pleaded for by this Informer, the presbyterian intereſt, and our Reformation according to the Covenant, will be extinct, ſold and betrayed. 2. Hearing Curats and peoples ſubjecting themſelves to their Miniſtry as the Paſtours of this Church. is by the Rulers required as *a direct badge and Teſt of owning Eraſtianiſm and prelacie, in oppoſition to the Covenant & work of Reformation*: So that its *a caſe of confeſſion*, now to adhere to a faithfull Miniſtry contending for it. 3. Ther's no other way to exoner our conſciences before God and the World, and Declare our nonconformitie to this courſe of backſliding, but by this practice, there is no getting of wrongs redreſt, or corruptions in the Miniſtry removed. Thus the Apology pag. 272. 4. We are in the Covenant engadged againſt *Indifferency*, in this great work of Reformation, and is not this the way to fall into it more and more. 5. We engadge that we ſhall endeavour, that *this work of Reformation ſhall remain inviolable to poſterity*. But what memory ſhall the poſterity have of this work if prelats and curats be thus ſubmitted unto? 6. We engadge oppoſition in our capacity to all prelatick malignant enemies of the Lords worke and intereſt; but how is it performd when we thus ſtrengthen their hands, in their avowed oppoſition therunto. 7. How *aſſiſt we and Defend in this common cauſe of Religion and liberty, ſuch as en-*

ter

*ter into this league*, when we thus Divide from our ſuffering brethren, wound and offend them and ſhake off a faithfull Covenant-keeping Miniſtry. 8 How maintain we our reformed Doctrine, worſhip, and union, when thus owning falſe prophets, and the inſtruction that cauſeth to err from the words of knowledge, and ſuch as cauſe Diviſions and offences contrary to the Doctrine we have Learnd. Prov. 19. 27. Rom. 16. 17, 18. 9. How *maintain we the priviledges of our Church and her Reformed Government?* when owning intruding prelats and their creatures as Miniſters of this Church, and diſowning her true Miniſters, now taking her by the hand. This practice is ane approving of Curats call and miſſion, rather then that of presbyterian Miniſters, which no man will deny to be contrary to the Covenant. Next, owning and adhering to Curats in this our caſe, and according to our principles, hath *an acceſſion to much guilt otherwiſe*, ſuch as. 1. The owning of a palpably blaſted, and Diſowning a palpably ſealed Miniſtry. 2 A high reflection on the ſufferings of many Godly upon this ground. 3. A ſhutting of our eyes againſt Miniſterial Diſcoveries of the ſin and duty of the time. 4. A caſting of our ſelves on tentations of greater complyance. 5. A breaking of fellowſhip with theſe that are contending for Gods worke and denying a ſympathy with them, yea a trampling on their blood which has been ſhed on this ground. 6. A diſowning the Miniſteriall authority, and tearing the commiſſion of Chriſts faithfull Ambaſſadours, and depriving our ſelves of the bleſſing and benefit of their Labours &c.

5. This practice of denying a Subjection to the Miniſtry of Conformiſts, and of our Rulers demanded conformity therin unto the preſent courſe of defection, will be found to fall under great

*ſcripture obligations, ſuch as* 1. The obligation of *perſevering in integrity, and holding it faſt.* Coloſ. 1. 23. Heb. 10. 23. Pſal. 25. 21. Suppoſing prelacy unlawfull, and the binding force of the Covenants in reference to all the work of reformation as it ſtood eſtabliſht, this practice is clearly croſs to the premiſed obligation, both as ane acknowledgement of prelacy and Eraſtianiſme, and alſo as a Diſowning of faithfull Miniſters. 2. The obligation of *keeping at the greateſt Diſtance from ſin*, expreſt Jude 23. 1 Theſſ. 5. 22. 1 Tim. 5. 22. will infer Diſowning Curats in this caſe. 1. All Direct, or interpretative conſent to ſin, is here Diſcharged. 2. A practice otherwiſe lawfull, will on this ground become *inexpedient hic & nunc.* We muſt not eat in the caſe of offence, tho we may freely eat all meats Rom. 14. 14. 1 Cor. 10. 25. Now on the forementiond Suppoſitions, the owning of Curats hath an acceſſion to their ſin, beyond that of ane *apearance or a touch*, It being both a Deſerting the presbyterian Miniſtry, and a badge of conformity to Eraſtian prelacy, and all the corruption and defection of the time, which is therby advanc'd & promoted, 'tis alſo in this caſe of competition, a deliberat adherence to the prelatick rather then presbyterian intereſt. 3. The great obligation of *a teſtimony to truth and Duty*, expreſt Heb. 10. 23. Mat. 10. 32. will plead for this practice, *All truth* muſt be avowed, & *practically avowed.* We muſt walk *circumſpectly, or exactly* as the Word imports, & we muſt avow truth & duty on the greateſt hazard; even the ſmalleſt mater is great, when *a teſtimony is concernd in it*, were it but the circumſtance of *an open window*, Daniel durſt not ommit it upon the greateſt hazard. And as this teſtimony muſt be *full*, ſo muſt it alſo be *conſtant.* Demas ſhame is, that the afflictions of the goſpel made him forſake the Apoſtle after great appearances for Chriſt, and em-

embrace this present world. And beside, whatever *truth or duty is opposed*, that becomes *the speciall object of this testimony*. Hence Ministers and Professours in their capacity are called to contend for this Work of Reformation; and Ministers silence as to *a Ministerial testimony* against this course of backsliding, and *people's disowning them*, and *adhering to Conformists*, is so palpably crosse therunto, as nothing can be more. 4. This practice is inferd from the scripture obligation, to guard *against the stumbling and offending our brethren*, expresst 2 Cor. 6. 3. Math. 18. 6. 1 Cor. 10. 32. Here is Discharged any *Dictum vel factum quo alius deterior redditur, saith Polanus.* Whatever practice gives occasion of our brothers sinning, of calling truth in question, of acting with a Doubting conscience, or which weakens his plerophory or assurance, is here discharged. And neither the lawfulness nor Indifferency of the thing it self, nor mens Authority commanding it, Nor the weakness, yea or wickedness of those in hazard to be stumbled, will warrand the Doing of that out of which offence arises. Paul Declares all meats lawfull, yet will not eat in case of offence 1 Cor. 10. 25. 1 Cor. 8. 13. This Declaring of *the lawfulness of that practice*, is equivalent to *any civill Declarator or Law* which alters not the nature of scandal. Paul will not have the weak stumbled Rom. 14. 1, 2, 3. 1 Cor. 8. 11, 12. Nor give occasion to the malicious who desired occasion 2 Cor. 11. 12. Now owning of Curats as the case is now circumstantiat doth harden them in their apostacy, and hath a tendency to wound the peace of the godly who dare not owne them, or may provoke them to act against their light; and therefore unless owning them could be proved a necessary duty, as matters now stand, the premisd scripture obligation will infer it to be sinfull. 5. disowning conformists will clearly

follow from the ſcripture obligation, *to turn away from ſeducers*, and ſuch as turn aſide from Gods way. 2 Tim. 3. 1. The apoſtle having given a large Induction of evills adhering to theſe in the laſt dayes, putting among the reſt of their black *Theta's*, *Covenant breaking*, concludes his diſcovery with this grand precept (ver. 5.) *from ſuch turn away*. We muſt beware of falſe prophets, the conciſion, and of ſuch as walk not according to the received ordinances, Math. 7. 15. Rom. 16. 17. Philip. 3. 2. 2 Theſs. 3. 6. Chriſts ſheep do flee from the ſtranger, and hear not his voice. John. 10. 27. 1 All promoters of wayes contrary to the ſimplicity of the goſpel, are here commanded to be eſchewed. 2. We muſt know and diſcover ſuch by their fruits and practicall unfaithfulneſs, as well as falſe Doctrine, Mat. 7. 16. compared with 2 Tim 3. Theſe that practically act the foxes Cant. 2. 15. are to be taken away, and conſequently eſchewed, the ſaints muſt be fortifyed againſt theſe *that ly in wait to deceive*, God diſowns theſe that make ſad the hearts of the godly and ſtrengthen the hands of evill doers. Ezek 13. 22. ſuch as ſtand not in his counſel Ier. 33. 22. & cauſe people to err by their lies and lightneſs. Ier. 26. 32. Now upon the forementiond ſuppoſitions its clear that Conformiſts are leading aſide from our Reformation, oppoſing the principles & priviledges, of this Church; they are *Covenant breakers* from whom we are *to turn away*; they are ſpeaking peace to the wicked, and healing the wound ſlightly, and are ruling with force and rigour Ezek. 34. 4. 1 Pet. 5. 3. Witneſs their preſent violence. 6. This practice of Presbyterian Miniſters officiating in oppoſition to this courſe, and peoples adherence to their Miniſtry, is inferr'd from the ſcripture obligation of *many terrible charges and adjurations laid upon Miniſters*, *in reference to a faithfull diligence in their Miniſterial function*, *and a ſuteable Miniſterial teſtimony*

*mony concerning the ſin and duty of the time*, which is neceſſarly incluſive of their peoples reciprocal diligence, in attending their Miniſtry, and their obedience and faithfull adherence accordingly. They are commanded to *cry aloud and ſhew the people their ſin Iſa.* 58. 1. and as they would not have the blood of ſouls upon them, to give faithfull warning touching ſin and duty, and their peoples caſe and hazard, eſpecially in times of great ſin and judgement, when God is terribly pleading his controverſy with them Ezek. 3.17. hence they are enjoyned *to be inſtant in ſeaſon and out of ſeaſon, reproving, rebuking and exhorting with all long ſuffering and Doctrine* 2 *Tim.* 4. 1. And as faithfull *watchmen on Ieruſalems walls, never to hold their peace day nor night till ſhe be eſtabliſht, and made a praiſe in the earth Iſa.* 62. 6. *to fulfill and make full proof of their Miniſtry Colloſ* 4.17. And as theſe comands in order to Miniſterial diligence, do ſingularly oblige herunto in this caſe, ſo the *ſcripture woes and threatnings thundered againſt Miniſters negligence and unfaithfulneſs*, are very convincing and awakening. See Ezek. chap. 3. and chap. 13. 5, 6. Hence on the forementiond ſuppoſitions it clearly followes. 1. That Miniſters are oblidged to be conſtantly inſtant in ſeaſon and out of ſeaſon, in their Miniſterial teſtimony againſt this courſe of defection. 2. This caſe of defection and perſecution ampliats and extends this duty to all to whom they can have acceſs, as the ſcattered preachers Acts. 8. Went every where preaching the goſpel, after that perſecution that aroſe about Stephen. 3. This Miniſterial teſtimony upon the forementioned grounds, muſt be levelled at all the corruptions of the times, and all the branches and degrees of our defection. 4. The duty and obligation of the people of God, is reciprocall and commenſurable therunto. And if hearing Curats and

diſowning Presbyterian Miniſters, be not inconſiſtent with this great obligation, let any Iudge.

6. That party in a Reformed Church, which having overturnd her Reformation, hath ſhut out, laid aſide, and perſecute away ſound adherers therunto both Miniſters and profeſſours, and will not admit Miniſters to officiat, but upon the ſinfull terms of complyance with their way, cannot charge the ſound party with ſchiſm in ſtanding where they were, & owning and proſecuting their reſpective duties, as Miniſters and flocks, in oppoſition to theſe overturners and backſliders. For this would juſtify the moſt ingraind ſchiſm that ever was heard of; Now ſo the caſe is here, for all Presbyterian Miniſters are caſt out, and they and all ſound profeſſours adhering to them perſecute, unleſs they will retract their principles, and conform to prelacie. Miniſters, in taking up a new tenour and exerciſe of their Miniſtry in a precarious ſervile dependence upon Eraſtian prelacy, headed and influenced by a meer civil papacy; And people, in ſubjecting themſelves to the Miniſtry of the ſervile deputes of Eraſtian prelates, as a badge of their hearty complyance with, and ſubmiſſion unto, this blaſphemous ſupremacy, and conſent to the overturning of the pure conſtitution and reformation of this Church. So that the Presbyterians their plea is an owning of duty againſt Schiſmaticks diſowning it. Do not our Divines tell the Romaniſts on this ground, *that they have ſeperat and perſecute us away from them, and that therefore the ſchiſm lyes upon themſelves, not on us*: So the caſe is here. Let this man ſay, what would have been the judgement of our Church in any of her former judicatories, anent a party owning ſuch principles as Conformiſts do, and perſecuting or caſting out all that oppoſe them, and dare not concurr in their courſe of backſliding in overturning the ſworn Refor-

Reformation of this Church; I dare appeal to the Informer himself, if such would not have been judged censurable as the worst of Schismaticks. And he can assigne nothing now to turn or cast the scale, no ground of disparity, unless he place it in this, *that prelatists are the greater number, and have the civil power on their side.* And if this pityfull plea will carry it, the Romanists have long since outweighed the protestant Churches in this debate, which this man will not for very shame admit.

7. This practice of adhering to Presbyterian Ministers, and disowning Curats, hath nothing of the *ingredients of schism or sinfull separation from this Church*, included therein, as matters now stand, and as the question is stated on the forementioned hypotheses. Which will appeare in these cleare positions in the point of schism (which are evident in their own light) being applyed and brought home to our present case. 1. Schism is *a starting out from under due relations to a Church and from her Ministry*, and duties accordingly. But in this our case, and practise under debate, Ministers and professours *are pursuing the duties of their respective relation to this Church*, as it stood reformed and established before these innovations, and the Apostat prelatick party are doing the contrary. 2. In a sinfull Schismatick separation, it is alwayes supposed *that the withdrawing is from those who are holding the communion of the true Church*, otherwise we lose the basis and fundation of all sound definitions of schism. But here the persecute party *are owning the Reformation of this pure Church against a party of separatists*, who have broken her order, union, and National vows; and who are also censurable by all her standing acts. 3. In a proper Schismatick separation, *the principles and practice of these from whom the separation is made, are supposed to be subservient to that Churches union, right establishment,*

*and for maintaining her communion*; but to ſeparat from thoſe whoſe principles and practice is a ſtated oppoſition (and in ſo far as an oppoſition) to her purity and Reformation, is to maintain her true union and communion, and not ſinfully to ſeparat from it.

The Aſſumption as to this practice under debate, might be cleard by a large induction of particulars. If we take a view of the two parties (Presbyterian and prelatical) their carriage in relation to this Church: It will be evident, 1. In general, That Conformiſts their principles and practice, is a direct impeachment of our eſtabliſht reformation, and that Presbyterians are maintaining and adhering to the ſame. 2. Conformiſts do avowedly diſowne and abjure our Covenants, Presbyterians adhere unto and owne the ſame. 3. Conformiſts are breaking and diſſipating our Churches eſtabliſht order and union, Presbyterians are in this practice contending for both; the one party is wounding our Church both by perſecution and reproach, the other is taking her by the hand, endeavouring her help and comfort in this her deep diſtreſſe, and ſo the Covenant obliges to diſowne the firſt, and adhere to the ſecond. 4. The one is cenſurable by her, the other deſerves her praiſe. Now can there be any queſtion in this, to which of theſe parties people are obliged to adhere according to the principles of our Reſormation.

In the 4th place, In a ſinfull ſeparation as to communion in worſhip, it muſt be ſuppoſed, *the worſhip of that Church owned and eſtabliſht therein*, becauſe a party innovating herein, as well as innovating in doctrine and government contrary to that which is eſtabliſht, are *hactenus*, *and ipſo facto* (in this their practice, and upon this very ground) ſchiſmaticks both in their worſhip and government. Therefore to diſowne them therein can be no ſchiſm; for this would involve a palpable

palpable contradiction, that these withdrawers in this same practice, and in the same respects and circumstances therof, were Schismaticks and not Schismaticks. Now prelatists their doctrine is new and odd, and not the voice of this Church. And their worship, (over and above the corruption adhering to it) is the worship of an innovating party, and contrary to our Churches establisht order. And therfore to disowne them therein is no sinfull separation from this Church her fellowship and worship, while existing in her sound and purer part, and opposing these innovations.

5. In Schismatick separation, *the rent is made in the bowels of the true and genuine Church.* So that when a schism and rent is stated betwixt a godly Ministry contending for a pure Churches Reformation, against an apostat party of the Ministry; the sound professours stand preobliged to adhere unto, and strengthen the sounder part, *upon this very ground of holding the union and communion of that pure Church against these backsliders*; supposing they will rent and ruine her, if not opposed: and so the case is here. The *union* and *order* of this Church, is already broken by the prelatick innovators and backsliders, and by them only; so that upon the supposal of this fixed schism, the people of God must adhere to the sound Church and Ministry. And in this *extreme necessity*, the *lesser obligation* as to parochial order, must give place to the *greater duties* of preserving and maintaining the Churches union and reformation, when a course is carried on tending to ruine it.

6. Every sinfull separation is, *from the fellowship of a Church either in her Ministry, lawfull courts, or Worship and ordinances*, according to the various relations, state and condition of Separatists, whether Church officers or others. But in this our case, Presbyterian Ministers and professours separat in none of these respects

from the genuine Church of Scotland. 1. Miniſters ſeparat not from *her courts*; for none of her lawful courts are now publickly own'd or exiſtent. 2. People ſeparate not from *her Worſhip*, as it ſtood reformed and vowed unto, when they owne the *ordinances diſpenſed by her true paſtours*, for that only is the true Worſhip of this Church. Nor 3. from *her Doctrine*, and *a due ſubjection to her faithfull paſtours in the Lord*: And therefore neither from the fellowſhip of her faithful Miniſters and profeſſours. Where is then the Schiſm? Since both the Doctrine, Worſhip and Government of this true Church are ownd, and backſliders and Schiſmaticks only (and as ſuch) are diſownd.

7. Schiſm ſuppoſes that theſe whom we withdraw from, *are ſuch to whom we are under obligation to adhere*: for it is *a breach of union*, which is cemented and conglutinate by the *obligations* and *duties* of thoſe who are concerned to hold it faſt; So that where *the obligation to the duty* in ſubſerviency to this union cannot be demonſtrate, to be incumbent upon ſuch and ſuch perſons, and in ſuch acts, By whom and wherein this union is to be upheld, the charge of *Schiſm* upon theſe acts, which are ſuppoſed to violat that union, evaniſhes and falls to the ground. But if the perſon (tho a Miniſter ſuppoſed) from whom the ſeparation is made, *wants that which immediatly grounds this obligation of owning him hic & nunc*, as the caſe ſtands circumſtantiat, in that reſpect withdrawing or non-union can be no Schiſm, for elſe the moſt ingraind Schiſmaticks might be owned; the Informer himſelf muſt of neceſſity admit this, for otherwiſe he will croſſe and cut the ſinews of all his pleading and arguments which he preſents in this Dialogue for diſowning Presbyterian Miniſters in this our caſe, for I am confident that out of this circumſtanciat caſe he will grant

grant *that it is no breach of any of his rules or reasons to hear them.* That [they are Ministers] and [are preaching faith and repentance] that [they have a lawfull Ministeriall call and ordination &c.] All these he thinks will plead nothing, as the case is now circumstantiat, for adhering to them, because of that in their present condition, which outweighs all this, and looses peoples obligation to owne them, which he thinkes is no Schism but duty: Now, let our Informer turn the tables; if there be first that in Curats present state, which preponderats as to our disowning of them now, tho all that he pleads as to their *ordination*, and *ministerial call* were granted, its no Schism in this our case to disowne them according to his own principles and pleading in this point. 2. He must grant that denying to hear *hic & nunc*, *and in such a complex case*, is different from *a denying to hear simpliciter*, or *disowning such a mans Ministry simpliciter*, or absolutely, as he will grant that out of this case *Presbyterian Ministers might be heard*, and that disowning them is not *simpliciter a disowning a true Ministry or Church, or them as Ministers*; So that its this *case of competition with Conformists*, which with him casts the ballance. Hence as matters now are stated and circumstantiat, and upon our principles and premised Hypotheses, he must grant there is that in conformists case, which *hic & nunc* will loose our obligation to *receive the ordinances from them as the ministers of this Church*, which is the *white in the marke* wherat all his arrows are shot. Such as 1. that we are preobliged by a lawful Oath to extirpat and disowne them. 2. That they are promoters of a Prelatick designe to ruine our Reformation. 3. That they have avowedly disownd our Covenants, and that we are commanded by the overturners of our Covenanted Reformation, to hear them as a badge of our renouncing it; and concurring in this course of backsliding. 4. That they

are

are intruders, and not entring in at the door, and in the way and order of this Church; That they are violently thrusting out, and persecuting her faithfull Pastours, that they perjuriously renounce a call from the people, and ordination by the Presbyterie. All which grounds he must either grant will supersede our obligation to owne conformists *hic & nunc* according to our principles, or quite his plea and pleading as to the disowning of Presbyterian Ministers in the exercise of their Ministry.

8. He pleads in the close of the preceeding Dialogue, *that the covenant abjures Schisme.* Now let us stand to this Decision; the Informer will not be dissatisfyed if I shall borrow one of his topicks, and shoot ane arrow from his own bow; I would offer then to him this syllogisme. That Schism which he pleads against is a Schism abjured in the Covenant: but disowning Conformists in their present state & circumstances, & refusing to be subject to them as the Ministers of this Church, is not a schism abjur'd in the Covenant; *Ergo*, &c. The assumption I prove thus. If the disowning of Presbyterian Ministers in their present state and circumstances, and withdrawing from them in the exercise of their Ministerial function and their Ministerial testimony against prelacy and for the Covenant, be that schism which is abjurd therin then a refusing to be subject to Curats (against whom they are testifying as the Covenant breakers, and upholders of prelacy) ad not owning them as the Ministers of this Church, cannot be that scism. Unless he will mak this scism, such a Janus as will cast a maligne condemning aspect upon both the contending parties, and bring adherers unto either of the two, under this imputation. But so it is that disowning of Presbyterian Ministers in the exercise of their Ministry, is condemned in the Covenant as schism this we have already made appear,

pear, it being a disowning of that establisht order and union of this Church which therin we do swear to maintain, and a schismatical withdrawing from her faithfull Ambassadours and others contending for the ends of the Covenant, to adhere unto whom, and keep up an union with them herein, the Covenant layes upon us an expres obligation, putting the imputation of *schismatick division*, and *detestable indifferency* upon the contrary practice. *Ergo*, upon the whole it follows evidently, that the owning of Conformists which he pleads for in this Dialogue (viz. subjection unto, and receiving ordinances from them as the Ministers of this Church, and denying this to Presbyterian Ministers) is abjurd in the Covenant as Schismatical.

## Chap. II.

*The* Informers *charge of* internal *and* external Schisme, *put upon Non-conformists: of impeaching the Churches constitution, and her practice in point of Worship for more than a* 1000 *Years, examind. His argument from Rom.* 14. *Heb.* 10. 25. *answered, and retorted upon him. His answer to the argument taken from* the command of seeking the best gifts, *considered. As also his argument from ancient canons, from the Act of the Assembly* 1647. *from the reciprocal tye betwixt a Minister and his flock, to fortify his charge of Schism, repell'd.*

HAving thus cleard our question and plea, & fortified our practice with these arguments; We come now

now to examine the grounds on which this new Casuist imputes *sinfull separation* to us therein, We acknowledge the evil of *Schism* upon these Texts mentioned by him, which might have caused sad reflectings on himself and his party, who are guilty of divisions and offences contrary to our received ordinances, and the doctrine of this Church: And so are lashed by that Scripture Rom. 16. 17. And who would have have us saying I am of this or that Rabbi or Prelat, contrary to 1 Cor. 1: 12. It's they who have disowned a spirituall pure unity with this pure Church, and are seeking a perjurious union in departing from God, contrary to that precept Ephes. 4: 3. And are so far from esteeming others in Lowlines of mind better then themselves, as we are enjoynd. Phil 2. 2. That their Rabbies trample on all Ministers; and their underlings do most insolently persecute and despise faithfull Pastours for adhering to the Reformation, authority, and union of this Church, against their innovations. Schism is no doubt an evill which hath much infested the Church, and our Church: and the Scripture sufficiently discovering the evill thereof we need not Cyprian, nor Jeroms elogies anent unity, to persuaed it. Only where he insinuats from that saying of Cyprian, which he mentions. Who asserts from 1 Cor. 13. [that who are slain in their Schism, their inexpiable sin is not purged by their blood, and that they are not Martyrs] that such is the case of the suffering people of God at this time; we may discern the cruell venome and sting of this mans malice, for all the sobriety which he pretends unto; I shall only tell him, that as its more then he will be ever able to prove, that the Lords remnant are guilty of this sin, and are assembling *out of the Church*, when attending the Ministry of Christs faithfull Ambassadours in this Church, so he and his fellows setting

ting theſe murderers upon them in this duty, will (if they repent not) be expoſed to that vengeance which the cry of their ſouls under the altar, who have been ſlain for this their Teſtimony, doth plead for. He would alſo do well to reſolve this doubt upon Cyprians Teſtimony, viz. Whether Cyprian did ever hold, or if himſelf will dare to aſſert, *that the blood and ſufferings of the beſt of martyrs did expiat their guilt.* As for Jeroms aſſertion [that Schiſm and Hereſy, or ſome degree of it go together.] I think it is fitly applicable to himſelf and fellow Conformiſts, who ſince their departing from the unity of this Church, and her ſworn Reformation, have not only, to juſtify their courſe vented groſs errours in point of Oaths, and otherwiſe, but are now (as every one ſees) poſting faſt to Rome, in denying many and great points of our Proteſtant profeſſion. We accord to Auguſtines ſaying [that ſeparatiſts (as ſuch) receive no life from the body] & the unqueſtionable godlineſs, & fellowſhip with the Father and the Son, to which many Presbyterians are admitted, and wherein they ſhine, compared with the abominable prophanity of the whole of thoſe almoſt that owne Curats, will by this rule declare who are the Schiſmaticks, and ſeparatiſts from Chriſts body. The comment of the *Thorn which rents the lilie* Cant. 2. 2. Is very ſuteable to him, and thoſe of his way, who have now of a long time rent the Lords faithfull flock, wounded our Church, and taken away her vail: eſteeming themſelves Chriſtians of the firſt magnitude, ſo he eſteems his moſt reverend Arch-Biſhops and reverend under-fathers; What pitifull preambles are theſe.

The Doubter alleadges [that every ſeparation is not ſchiſm.] This (as we heard) he acknowledges, and that *when communion with a Church cannot be held without ſin, ſeparation is neceſſary*; wherein he yeelds all that we plead

plead; ſince we have proved that in this our caſe, joyning to their way and party is in many reſpects ſinfull; and ſince he Inſtances *the proteſtants plea for ſeparating from Rome on this ground*, knowes he not that the Papiſts tell us ſuch ſtories anent *union with the Church, and that ſuffering without the Church is no Chriſtian ſuffering*, to Iuſtifie their bloody perſecutions, which very well ſutes his caſe. And no doubt the proteſtants anſwer, viz. [That we are in Chriſts Church, becauſe owning his truth, tho ſeparat from their ſynagogue, and that notwithſtanding this pretence, the blood of proteſtant Martyrs is in their skirts] doth ſute the caſe of Presbyterians in relation to their perſecuters.

But the great charge followes, viz. That *we are guilty of as groundleſs and unreaſonable ſeparation, as we ſhall read of in any age of the Church. Bona verba!* How is this made good? *firſt*, (ſaith he) *in caſting off Chriſtian love which is heart Schiſm.* 2. He chargeth with *external Schiſm in ſeparating in acts of Worſhip.* Now what if we recriminat in both theſe, and retort this double charge upon himſelf. Have they not diſownd the Worſhip of Presbyterian miniſters & Profeſſours, and charged all to ſeparat from them, meerly for noncomplyance with their perjured Prelats? 2. Have they not for many years glutted themſelves with their blood, I may ſay ſweemd in it, upon the ſame very ground of forbearance as to prelatick complyance, and endeavour by multiplyed lawes and Acts, to root them out of the very nation? Good Sir, Pull this beam out of your own eye, that you may ſee a litle clearer in this point. But as to the firſt he ſayes, that we *make difference in Judgement as to leſſer matters* (Church Government) *a ground of difference in affection, as if they were no Chriſtians who are not of our perſuaſion in theſe things, putting thus leſſer points into our creed*, and un

Churching

*unchurching and unſanncting all who are not of our perſuaſion therin.* *Anſ.* As to the firſt general charge, I know none more guilty then themſelves, who are contending with fire and ſword *tanquam pro aris & focis*, for theſe their *leſſer points*, and with unheard of rage, ſeeking the ruine of all who dare not comply in Judgement and practice with them therein. 2. I thinke Chriſtian affection to their ſouls, is beſt ſeen in oppoſing and teſtifying againſt their ſoul-deſtroying ſins. *Thou ſhalt by any means rebuke thy neighbour, and not ſuffer ſin upon him* is an old ſtanding rule. Levit. 19: 17. And if they be even hated in ſo far as owning pernicious wayes, its no more then what David avowes, Pſal 139:21,22 *do not I hate them that hate thee, I hate them with a perfect hatred. I account them my enemies, I hate the work of them that turn aſide, it ſhall not cleave unto me.* 3. As we have not ſo learn'd Chriſt, to call every thing *leſſer* or *ſmall points*, which his latitudinarian party have the confidence to term thus, ſo we know no *point of truth reveald and commended to us in the word*, as the object of our faith and matter of our practice, which ſhould be keept out of our creed, leſt *our faith become much ſhorter then the Scripture pattern.* And we acknowledge not the new patchment *of mens Lawes*, which this man and his fellow-Conformiſts have annext to their creed, and which can *pro arbitrio* make or unmake theſe his *leſſer points.*

But he ſayes, that *we unchurch and condemn all Churches in all ages who have ownd Biſhops, Liturgies, feſtivals and other ceremonies* ——— *And if we make the removal of theſe things neceſſary to a Church, there hath not been a Church for above a 1000 yeares together* *Anſ.* To make the laſt part of this argument not to contradict the firſt, he ſhould have ſaid that there has not been a Church without theſe things mentioned theſe 1600 years, but the

man seeing his first flight or Rodomontade too fierce; he did well to clap his wings closser. Upon a review of this page, I find our Informer in this charge playes but the pityfull Camelion and versipellis: for finding that this assertion of his, *that Christians of all ages, since Christs time and in all places have own'd Bishops, Liturgies, Festival dayes and other ceremonies*, would have drawn upon him the heavy burthen and task of a proofe, he lightens himself of this burthen, by a prudent [*almost*] which in this point is very significant. But his confining the liturgies, Festivals, and other ceremonies within the compass of the last thousand years (sullied with all popish abominations) appearing too simple inadvertency, within the compass of two or three lines, he secures it with a [*much above.*] But lest this prove too broad reckoning, he instances *the second or third century* from whence he sayes, we beginne our reckoning as to Bishops, festivals, liturgies, and other ceremonies. But 1. why mends he the matter so inadvertently, as to run in such a wide uncertainty as the the length of 200 yeares in that calculation which he imputes to us. 2. I challenge him to shew what presbyterian writter did ever commence the original of liturgies and festivals, with his blind &c. of other ceremonies (which will travell who knowes whither, and include who knowes what) from the third, far less the second century. I affirm that its more then he or any for him can prove, that the Church hath had Bishops, liturgies, and festivals since Christ. Our writters have abundantly proved the contrary; and we challenge him to shew either his Diocesan Bishops, liturgies, or festivals and the &c. of his ceremonies, in the first Apostolick Church, or in these two ages mentioned by him. That there were not diocesan Bishops then or long after, we have already proved, and far less Erastian

Pre-

Prelats. For holy dayes, let him ſhew by divine appointment any other then the Chriſtian Sabath, in the Apoſtolick Church if he can, or in the firſt ſucceeding ages. As for the feaſt of Eſther, it is acknowledged to have come in by cuſtome after the Apoſtolick times. For liturgies, we aſſert that the Apoſtolick Church and age knew no ſuch thing as ſet & impoſ'd liturgies and formes, other then Chriſts preſcriptions as to baptiſm & the Lords ſupper, and that they pray'd as was ſuteable to the preſent action and circumſtances of time, place, and perſons; If he betake him to the liturgies which are aſcribed to Peter, James, Mathew, Andrew, Clement, Mark, Dioniſius Areopagite, and other Diſciples: proteſtant writers will ſtigmatize him for embracing that which they have abundantly proved to be counterfit. That liturgies had no place for a long time in the Church, is proved by clear teſtimonies; Tertullian (Apol. cap. 30.) ſhews „ that in „ their publick Aſſemblies chriſtians did pray *ſine mo-* „ *nitore quia de pectore*, that is, *without a preſcription* „ *becauſe from their heart*. And in his treatiſe *de Ora-* „ *tione* ſayes, that there are ſomethings to be asked „ according to the occaſions of every man —— that „ the Lords prayer being laid as a fundation, its law- „ full to build on that fundation other prayers, ac- „ cording to every ones occaſion. Aguſtine epiſt. „ 121. tells us that *liberum eſt*, Its free to ask what „ was in the Lords prayer *alijs atque alijs modis*, ſome „ times one way ſomtimes another. Likewiſe „ Juſtin Martyr Apol. 2. tells us that he who Inſtru- „ cted the people pray'd according to his ability ποιᾳ δυνάμις ἀναπέμπει. We might alſo tell him of Biſhop Andrews ſucceſs, or rather diſappointment in ſeeking an old Jewiſh Liturgie, which when ſent to Cambridge to be tranſlated, was found to be compoſed long after the Jews rejection, ſo the Biſhop

being asham'd, suffered this notion to die and the Liturgie never saw the light. See Smectim and Didoclav. pag. 615,16, 17,18,19. & seq. 2. What consequence is this, that becaufe we disowne aSchismatick party of Innovators introducing these corruptions mentioned: Ergo we disowne them as no Churches wherein these have been admitted. Must we bring in, or comply with every corruption once purged out, the retaining whereof may be consistent with the essence of a true Church? what consequence or reason is here? Again, doth not he and all his brethren stand in direct opposition to the order and goverment of the Presbyterian Church of this Nation, and unto all that own's the same: will he then admit this consequence that he unchurches her before prelacie came in, and other reform'd Churches govern'd Presbyterially. So we see himself must acknowledge this his reasoning naught.

The Doubter alledges [that these things mention'd, are of later date then the Apostles.] To this he answers that *Bishops were from the Apostles time.* The contrary wherof we have proved either as to diocesan or Eraftian Bishops, such as he means, yea even a *proestos* which in the Apostolick age had no place, as we have made appear. Next, He tells us that *Polycrates in the debate about keeping of Esther with Victor Bishop of Rome, alledged Johns authority.* But *how proved he this*, is the Question, not *what he alledged*; surely bare alledging, as in other cases, so specially in divinity is bad probation; Then he asks, *if we will hence infer that they were no good christians who used these things suppose that they came in after the Apostles times?* I answer we thinke that in so far as innovating they were not *Sound Christians*, and so must he thinke unless he will be wise above what the Apostles have written; Then he tells us, *that from Rom. 14. It appears that albeit*

*beit ſome thought* (he ſhould ſay underſtood and knew) *that by their Chriſtian liberty they were freed from the ceremoniall Law and therefore made no diſtinction of dayes or meats yet Paul enjoyn'd them to bear with the weak, to account them brethren, and not deſpiſe them, and the weak were not to ludge the ſtrong. Ans.* 1. How proves he, that the points in controverſy viz. prelacie, laying aſide our vows and Covenants, Eraſtianiſm, liturgies, and feſtival-dayes for myſtical ends and uſes, are ſuch nothings or indifferent matters, as meats or dayes were at that time, wherin *pro re nata* the Church might uſe her liberty. As for dioceſan Eraſtian prelacy, we have made its antiſcriptural complexion to appear, ſo that it is not within the compaſs of any Lawfull liberty of the Church to embrace or eſtabliſh it; We have alſo made the binding force of the Covenants appear, and that the laying aſide of them conſequently, is a horrid guiltyneſs, which this liberty can never be extended unto. Likewiſe the liturgies and impoſing of ſet formes of prayer, and adſtricting publick Worſhip therunto, have been ſufficiently impugned from Scripture and divine reaſon, by ſeveral of the godly learned, and diſcovered to impeach the ſpiritual liberty of Goſpel Worſhip. The holy dayes alſo have with the ſame evidence been impugned by our divines, who have proven that they do impinge upon our Chriſtian liberty, are contrary to the fouth command enjoyning worke all the ſix dayes, except on ſuch occaſionall faſts and feaſts as are held out in the word, & likewiſe are reprobate by the New Teſtament prohibitions about ſuperſtitious obſervation of dayes: The Jewiſh dayes being abrogat (as the Informer cannot but grant) how dare we impoſe upon our ſelves a new yoke? If it were here pertinent to dilate upon theſe points, our principles herein might be abundantly fortifyed, and the truth cleard

to his conviction, and by consequence the impertinency of this parallel argument, and his pityful *petitio principii*, in equiparating the points now controvered with these things which are the object of Christian liberty. The *Informers* gives us nothing here but magisterial dictates. Again, that tolerance which the Apostle speaks of as to dayes and meats, relates to that time and case only of the weak Jews, when the ceremonies tho dead were not yet buryed (as they were to be honourably) especially while the temple of Jerusalem stood, and the legal worship therein by Gods providence was continued. But as these observances were ever discharged to the Gentiles (except as to blood and things strangled for that exigence only of the weak Jews) so after when christian liberty was known, and this particular exigence was over, and the ceremonies buried, It is within the liberty of no Church to unbury them, or tolerat these or such like observances in others. Finally this very text condemns him, tho his begged supposition were granted. For 1. *The eater must not despise him that eats not*: why then do Conformists pursue Nonconformists, with such grievous punishment and Lawes? they not only despise but persecute to the death, and vilely reproach them; *who art thou that judgest another mans servant?* why then do they Judge & censure Nonconformists so highly in their pulpits and pamphlets (and the Informer in this) as Schismaticks, of as deep a dye as ever the Church was infested with? 2. *He that but Doubts is damned if he eat*, saith the Apostle. Why then do they so violently press conscientious Doubters to their way? 3. *If thy brother be grieved* (saith the Apostle) *with thy meat, thou walks not charitably.* Why then are they so uncharitable as to grieve Nonconformists with prelatick exactions? if the Judging and despising the forbearer be forbidden, much more are their cruell edicts and constraining Lawes, whe-

whereby they burden the conſciences of tender forbearers in this caſe. The practice of *Victor* as to the Aſian Churches, was no doubt highly uncharitable, but it was ſo mainly becauſe of his cenſuring about ſuch a trifle as Eſther-obſervation; & we ſee from this ſchiſm the ſad effects of innovations; and that the Churches unity & peace is beſt keept by adhering to the ſimplicity of the goſpel: and ſo our departing from the goſpel ſimplicity in point of government, and introducing abjured prelacy, is the chief ground of the preſent ſchiſm, and confuſions in this Church.

But now followes our *Informers* main charge *of external ſchiſm, in ſeparating from the Churches communion in word and ſacraments, contrary to the apoſtles direction, Not to forſake the aſſemblies Heb.* 10. 25. *It ſeems* (ſaith he) *that ſome then out of pride and ſingularity forſooke the ordinary and orderly aſſemblies of Chriſtians. Ans.* In this accuſation his ſo much boaſted of charity is evaporate. What! No aſſemblies for worſhip in this Church but among Conformiſts; doth he not thus unchriſtian and unchurch all the Aſſemblies of Presbyterian Miniſters and profeſſors for worſhip? why perſuades he people to forſake theſe Aſſemblies? and who now Iudges another mans ſervant as he, who brands with-ſelf-conceit, ignorance, and ſchiſm all theſe Aſſemblies of Nonconforming Miniſters and profeſſours, who dare not comply with prelats. Again, how proves he that no aſſemblies are orderly except the Prelatical? we avow our meetings for worſhip, to be the moſt orderly according to our Churches eſtabliſhed Reformation, and that their Aſſemblies are croſs to her conſtution, order, and union, both in reſpect of Curats perjurious intruſion, the doctrine which they deliver, and their manner of worſhip, which is croſs to this Churches practice and appeintment; his charge of *ſchiſm* and *diſorderlineſs* is ſtill begged, but not yet

proved; and orderlineſs is (with him) deſcribed from Church-walls; and as for unity, why have they caſt out hundreds of Miniſters from officiating, becauſe they durſt not joyn with Conformiſts, in their perjur'd courſe of defection? if this man be not here ſelf convict, let any Judge. Let him produce (if he can) in our Aſſemblies for worſhip, that which is contraire unto the nature, conſtitution, and worſhip of the aſſemblies mentioned in that ſcripture; and untill this be, we may on better ground recriminat this charge upon his withdrawing people from the Aſſemblies of Presbyterian miniſters and profeſſors.

The Doubter alledges poorly that all do not forſake their parochial Aſſemblies, but ſome do now and then keep them. He Anſwers, that *tho all withdraw not in alike degree, yet the leaſt degree is unwarrantable — that people advance from ſtep to ſtep, that ſome after withdrawing from them, hear only the* Indulged, *or thoſe who have ſtill preached without conformity in their own Churches, and within a little will hear none of them; that ſome hear in their own Churches but will not communicat, the reaſon whereof he cannot underſtand, ſince the efficacy of Sacraments depends not on the Miniſter, that the leſt degree of ſeparation makes way for a greater — that Baxter in his cure of Church diviſions, tells of ſome turning ſeparatiſts, who dyed Infidels. Ans.* He hath not yet proved that the withdrawing which he mentions, is *a Sinfull Schiſmatick ſeparation*; and we hope we have made the contraire appear. As for theſe degrees he mentions, we ſay. 1. His cruell uncharitablneſs to Presbyterian Miniſtersis here very conſpicuous; ſince he will not allow them to be in the leaſt heard or own'd in their preſent caſe and circumſtances. Certainly to tye up people from occaſional improvement of the various gifts which God hath beſtowed upon his miniſters, even in a ſetled ſtate of the Church, and in her

right

right conſtitution, is croſs to that *intereſt in one anothers gifts and graces*, which the members of Chriſts myſtical body (upon the ground of their union and communion with the head, and among themſelves) are priviledged with. And in impeaching this the *Informer* blotes himſelf with ſciſmatick uncharitablenes of the deepeſt dye. 2. As its no ſtrange thing that in ſuch a time of darkneſs, deſertion, and defection, peoples recovery be gradual, and ſometime attended with Infirmities in the manner of duties incident to us while in time, ſo the contrary influences of love to truth and duty, and fear of hazard, may be eaſily productive of ſuch variety in the carriage of poor tender ſouls in this matter. In a word, the Lords ſupper being a ſpecial badge of our union and communion in and with Jeſus Chriſt, Its no ſtrange thing that tender ſouls ſcruple to partake thereof from men at ſo palpable a diſtance from him, as Conformiſts, eſpecially while this ordinance may be enjoyed more purely elſwhere. He tells us, *that Schiſmaticks ar cut off from the Body, and receive no life from it*, and (if we may draw an inference and retortion from this aſſertion) the people of God muſt judge Conformiſts to be ſuch. For theſe effects of ſeparation which Baxter mentions, we bleſs the Lord the contrary effects of ſound piety, in many who were prophane while owning the Miniſtry of Conformiſts, are convincingly apparent, ſince they ſeparated from them: and the effects of backſliding from Gods truth, viz. groſs prophanity, or atheiſtical Indifferency in the matters of God, are as ſadly evident in thoſe who having once own'd Presbyterian Miniſters, have return'd to Conformiſts again. As for what he objects and anſwers, *anent ſome of their own party going to others then their own pariſh-Curats, whom unleſs inſuperable lets hinder to attend their own pariſh-Church, he would have his fellows not to owne.* We are not much concernd to notice any fur-

ther, then to tell him that *parvo discrimine refert*, which of them people go to, the best of them being as a briar, and the most upright as a thorn-hedge, and all of them blotted with such Schismatick opposition to this Church her pure constitution and principles, as may put it beyond debate with tender souls, (lovers of truth and duty) that they ought adhere to Christs faithfull ambassadours rather then any of them.

The Doubter objects, [that its hard to hinder to go where we may be most edifyed; since *we must Covet the best gifts.* 1 Cor. 12. 31.] He answers 1. that *the Apostle is not directing private Christians, what gifts in others to seek after for their edification, but shews that though there are diversities of gifts, and every one should be content with his own, given for the edification of others, yet that he should seek after better, not in others, but in himself. Ans.* Our Informer doth but trifle and deal deceitfully in his way of representing this, and some objections ensuing; for 1. He supposes that this is lookt upon *in it self*, as a sufficient ground of adhering to Presbyterian Ministers, without previous consideration of *all the circumstances of our present case*; and also in supposing that nothing casts the ballance (in the Judgement of the objecter) as to profiting or not profiting, but *difference of gifts*; whereas we grant, that the soveraign Influence of Gods Spirit, (who teaches to profit) renders the means and ordinances effectual to salvation, whether the Ministers gifts be great or small. 2. We grant, that tho people have *a discretive Judgement* as to gifts, and their own profiting, and are to try the spirits, yet in a setled state of the Church, they are not to shake off the due regulation and guidance, of a faithfull Ministry set over them in the Lord, so as to be wholly at their own disposal herein: since there is no Justling betwixt *the privat discretive*, and *publick Mini-*

*Miniſterial judgement*, in this matter. 3. As in the tryall of Intrants, not only *the ſufficiency*, but *ſuteablenes of gifts* for ſuch a people, is to be eyed. So when a faithfull Miniſter is thus duely called and ſetled, people are obliged to owne his Miniſtry, by a due attendance upon the ordinances adminiſtred by him, which is all that decency, union, and order, and that act of our Church after mention'd, doth call for; which notwithſtanding cannot be ſuppoſed to exclude all occaſional uſemaking of other gifts beſtowed upon faithfull Miniſters, which were (as I ſaid) croſs to the communion of Saints, and beleevers intereſt in one anothers gifts and graces. But 4. our queſtion here being ſtated upon the ſuppoſition of the greater part of this National Church their apoſtacy & defection from our ſworn Reformation, and a great part of Miniſters and profeſſors adhering to their principles, viz. to which of the two parties on this ſuppoſition people are to adhere in worſhip? ſure the Lords palpable blaſting the backſliding party their gifts, as to any ſaving ſucceſs, and on the contrary his as palpable owning and ſealing with his bleſſing the Miniſtry of his faithfull ſervants adhering to his truth, is a loud call (in this broken ſtate of our Church, and caſe of defection and perſecution) to come out from the one party and way, and adhere to the other. So his Doubter in this and the next objection, ſhould have argued thus. *In this caſe of defection and overturning of our Reformation, God being pleaſed to ſeal with a palpable bleſſing on our ſouls, the word from Miniſters adhering to their principles, we may faſely look on this as a call from God to hear them, rather then the prelats perjurd hirelings, whoſe Miniſtry we have found palpably blaſted ſince they complyed with his courſe of perjurious backſliding, and oppoſition to Gods work.* In this caſe certainly its an argument very pungent, and founded on that of Jer. 23.

3.31, 32. Where the Lord threatneth the prophets *who cauſed the people to err by their lies and lightneſs, and whom he hath not ſent nor commanded tho they propheſie*, with this, *that therefore they ſhall not profite the people at all.* So the Argument going upon the ſuppoſition of our Churches broken and perſecute ſtate; and a competition betwixt *a faithfull Miniſtry*, and *a party of Schiſmatick Innovators, and overturners of our Reformation*, will infer nothing againſt our Churches ſetled order under Presbyterian goverment, nor the aſſemblies act. 1647. preſuppoſing the ſame; and its not meerly *the gifts*, but *Gods ſaving bleſſing* attending the ſame, which is the ground of this argument, and that practice pleaded for, thereby.

Now as to his anſwer, Its palpable that it meets not this argument in the leaſt, and beſides his excluſive gloſs is very impertinent, viz. *becauſe we are to ſeek the beſt and edifying gifts for our ſelfs in our ſtation, therefore we are not to ſeek the beſt in others alſo.* What conſequence is this? Sure the *Informer* will not deny *ſimpliciter*, that people are to ſeek after the moſt edifying Miniſter, and this will follow on the *very ground of our edification*, which we are to deſign in ſeeking the beſt gifts, in and for our ſelves. Nay, the one is the great mean ſubſervient to the other; a faithfull edifying Miniſtry is Gods Method for winning to the beſt gifts for my ſelf; and therefore as a mean leading to this end, fals within the compaſs *of this command, to ſeek and Covet the beſt gifts.* So a greater then he, Voetius, concludes it a duty to ſeek the beſt edifying Miniſtry, on this ground *De politeia Eccleſ. pag.* 52. And likewiſe on theſe Scriptures, Luk. 8, 18: 1 Theſſ. 5. 22. And removes objections to the cotraire.

His 2d anſwer is, *That the Apoſtle is there preſſing unity, and not to deſpiſe the meaneſt gifts, more then the meaneſt member, and to avoid Schiſm verſe 25. Anſ.*

Then

Then it followes, that in the ſenſe of this precept, which we have explain'd, ſeeking the beſt gifts, is conſiſtent with unity, and avoiding Schiſm, and conſequently in this our caſe, its no wayes inductive to ſchiſm, but conſiſtent with a due eſteem of the meaneſt gifted Miniſter who is faithfull, to withdraw from *ſcandalous innovators, who have already fixt a Schiſm in this Church*, by oppoſing her ſworn reformation, order, and unity. Nay as matters now ſtand, this is the ſureſt way to keep our Churches union and integrity; Since this their courſe has ſuch a clear tendency to the ruine of her Reformation and pure conſtitution, in doctrine, Worſhip, diſcipline and Government, as is above clear'd.

His 3d Anſwer is, *that edification is to be ſought in an orderly way, not in a way that marrs the Churches peace* ——— *and that though our ſenſe of this generall direction were granted, its thus to be underſtood. Anſ.* Let our ſworn eſtabliſht Reformation, its principles, rules, and deſign, ſit in Judgement and determine, who are greater enemies to this Churches peace and order, they or we. Was not this Church priviledged with a beautifull order of Government, pure Goſpel-Worſhip, and ſound doctrine, before Prelacy was introduced? Well then, the way to this Churches true peace, Union, and order, muſt be in oppoſing their *pretended order*, who are letting in the enemies, and have broken her walls and hedge. Many of them ſaid and ſwore that the Presbyterial Government of this Church, was a beautifull order, unto which ſince they ſtand in oppoſition, they are the moſt orderly, who diſowne them. As for that which he adds, *of peoples neglecting Miniſters ſet over them in the Lord*, he muſt prove *that Conformiſts are ſuch Miniſters*, who are both ſcandalous for the far greateſt part in their carriage, having no viſible badge of the Lords call,

call, and do owne principles, and carry on a deſigne point blank contraire to our reformation, have left the peoples conduct, in the way of truth, given up all their Miniſteriall authority to abjured prelacy, and make it their work to deſtroy, and waſte the Lords vineyard. Tho it were granted that they had been ſo ſet over people, yet ſince they are tracing wayes of Schiſm, and innovations condemned by our Church, Chriſts flocks cannot owne, or be ſubject to them, as their ſoules ſpiritual guides, they being men that have corrupted the Covenant of Levi, and made many ſtumble at the Law: And beſides ſince that complyance (in ſubjection to conformiſts, and diſowning of Presbyterian Miniſters) which he doth here plead for, is in very deed *a deſpiſing faithfull Miniſters ſet over their flocks by the Lord*, and *ſtanding in a Miniſteriall relation to them*; and whom conſequently the Lords people are called to honour and obey, this ſame reaſon whereby he would perſuade to adhere to the conforming party, pleads more ſtrongly againſt them. And his rule aftermentioned *not to do evill that good may come of it*, will conclude that we ſhould not under pretence of keeping parochiall order, or for eviting confuſion, deprive our ſelves of the bleſſing of the Miniſtry of Chriſts faithfull Ambaſſadours, to adhere unto whom in this caſe we are under ſo many obligations.

As for the Canons after'cited by him, *againſt Miniſters receiving theſe of another congregation to the Worship*, We ſay, that according to the Informer himſelf its clear that ſuch *rules of decency and order*, are not calculat for every meridian, every time and caſe of the Church: extraordinary caſes muſt have ſuitable remedies, and circumſtances of *parochial order*, cannot in this caſe be pleaded, when *our main order of Government* is already deſtroy'd, and a perſecuting party is in our

our Churches boſome, tearing out her bowels; when a beſidged city hath within her walls a party of profeſſed defendants betraying her to the enemie, they are the moſt orderly and faithfull watchmen who reſiſt them, and run to the poſts which they have betrayed. Again, ſhould the many Miniſters now perſecute (let us ſuppoſe they are reſiding in the bounds) plead parochial order, for their pariſhes adhering to them, and diſowning their Curats incumbent, the Informer will not ſay, that *parochial order*, will plead for owning them in this caſe. Or in the caſe of conforming Miniſters turning enemies to Prelats, and by conſequence Schiſmaticks in his account, he will grant that the people (whom we will ſuppoſe they are breaking off from the union of the Prelatick Church) ought not to owne them, but were concern'd to go elſe where to hear. Now, the caſe being ſo with us this argument by his own confeſſion, cannot now have weight until all that we plead againſt them on this ground, be anſwered.

Next, he cites *the Act of the Aſſembly* 1647. *Againſt them who withdraw uſually from the Worſhip in their own congregation, except in urgent caſes made knowen unto, and approven by the Presbytery.* Concluding, *that therefore they thought not this a fit method of edification, & that this act was made to prevent Schiſm.* But had he ſet down the narrative of that act, it might have coverd him with blushes, and would expoſe him to the cenſure of every Reader; for it is grounded upon, „ the then compleat eſtabliſh- „ ment of the work of Reformation, this Churches „ comely order of Presbyterian Government then exer- „ ciſed, her Presbyterian unity and peace, the purity „ and liberty of the Goſpel ordinances then righly en- „ joyed. But what will this ſay to the preſent caſe of defection and perſecution, wherein the faithful Miniſtry are thruſt from their flocks, and that work raz'd

dare

dare he say this assembly did intend to stretch their act to such a case as this, or to stop Ministers from officiating in such a distrest & destroyed condition of our Church Suppose this case had been stated in that Assembly, *What if Presbyterian Government shall be razed, Prelacie erected, the Covenant and the work of Reformation overturned and disowned by a number of* Ministers, *while a stedfast body of the* Ministry *stands against them, shall this act reach the people in relation to their faithfull Pastours, ejected perjur'd intruders?* I dare refer it to this man himself to say to it, what their resolution would have been, and if they would have concluded it the people's duty to adhere to these destroyers in that case, rather then the faithfull contenders for the work of Reformation. In the 7th Article of their directions for family Worship past that same day, they suppose this Church to be then *blest with peace and purity*; and therefore do except from the compass of these directions, the case of *corruption and trouble*, wherein they say, *many things are commendable, which are not otherwise tollerable*; And dare he say that they would not call this *such a case*. He makes the Doubter yet again poorly except, [that men have different gifts] which is here a meer nauseating repetition, to fill up idle pages. Upon this our Informer very discreetly and charitably tells us, *that we can litle judge of an edifying gift, and do call railing at Bishops, or at the civil powers, and a tone in the voice so.* Just as Dr Burnet said before in in his roaving Dialogues. What is the Judgement of Gods people as to edification, and the evidence of the Masters presence with Presbyterian Ministers in preaching to his people, depends not on this Character, it being comprobat by clear proofs, and sufficiently notour to such as can spiritually taste and discern.

But

But he will offer ſome conſiderations about *diverſity of gifts, and edification by them*, which is to no purpoſe; ſince our plea is not meerly grounded upon the gifts of preachers whether Conformiſts or others; but abſtracting from this, we ſay firſt, there is much more then *meer gifts*, yea and an *edifying gift*, requiſit to ground a peoples owning a Miniſter *hic & nunc*, or *in every circumſtantiat caſe*, as their paſtour: what if he be in a ſchiſmatick courſe? what if he be violently thruſt in, and hath ſhut out their Lawfull paſtour ſtanding in that relation to them, to whom by this mans conceſſion they owe *ſpecial ſubjection, reverence and obedience in the Lord*? (for this we will find him hereafter plead) are the people bound in this caſe to owne the Intruder, becauſe of his gift? Nay he will not ſay it. Now the caſe is Juſt ſo with us. 2. We told him that our caſe is a caſe of competition betwixt the betrayers and deſtroyers of our Reformation, and a faithfull Miniſtry adhering to, and contending for it; ſo that its this great Miniſterial qualification of *faithfullneſs*, (oppoſit to Curats *treachery*) beſide Presbyterian Miniſters gifts, and Gods bleſſing attending the ſame: and the *Curats intruſion, unfaithfulneſs, deſtructive principles, and deſign* in their officiating (beſides their inſufficiency, prophanity, and blaſted gifts) which determine us in this matter; and the Lords call conſequently that for our edification, and to prevent our Church her ruine, and our periſhing in their ſin, we come out from among them and be ſeparat, as we would come out of Babylon to which their party is running poſt: ſo that all he ſaith here, may be granted without prejudice to our cauſe.

But let us hear his conſiderations *anent edification and gifts; firſt*, (ſaith he) *all Miniſters have not alike gifts, therfore we muſt not undervalue the loweſt* 1 Cor. 12. I told him our quarrel is not meerly gifts, & a man may be *hic*

*& nunc* disown'd, and yet no *undervaluing of his gifts*, which the *Informer* must either grant, or contradict all that he intends in this pamphlet. For I ask him, what if I plead this for Presbyterian Ministers, whom for all their excellent and edifying gifts he and his party will not owne, and whom he is in this pamphlet striving might and main *tanquam pro aris and focis*, to get universally disown'd by all professours in Scotland? why quarrells he with the Almighty (to use his own expression) in undervaluing their gifts, and would teare their commission? I know our Informer will say that they are disorderly, and so disowning them, is no despising their gifts. Well then, he grants that men of excellent gifts may be *hic & nunc* or in some cases disown'd, and no hazard of this undervaluing and despising their gifts, or quarrelling with the Almighty, & so the rebound of his own blow in this retortion strikes his argument stark dead; and he must grant that the question is, *which of the two contending parties, have best right to officiat as Ministers in the Church of Scotland, according to her principles and Reformation?* and according thereto it will not be difficult to determine who are the most orderly & to be heard, & the disorderly have no reason to complain. 2. He sayes *we must not think the meanest gifts, useless.* But he must grant that men may sinfully render them useless, as he alleges Presbyterian Ministers do and we prove that conformists do so. 3. He tells us *that the best gifts cannot work without the spirit, and that to dote on gifts, is to idolize men, as those* 1 Cor. 1. 3. Then he tells us, *how Zanchius was offended with that frenchman of Geneva, who said he would leave Paul, should he come there, and hear Calvine.* But what will this arguing reprove? must they be stigmatiz'd as Idolizers of men and gifts, who will not Idolize abjur'd prelacy, and perjur'd apostats, and in owning them while wasting and destroying a purely reformed

orm'd Church, diſcountenance a faithfull Miniſtry contending for her reformation, and ſignally bleſſ'd therein? ſurely his inſtance anent Zanchius, may be well apply'd to ſuch as will hear none but Curats, and wholly diſowne Presbyterian Miniſters; Again, if the beſt gifts cannot work without the ſpirit, and the ſpirit works ordinarly and beſt with thoſe who entertain him, and as having their ſenſes exerciſed, habitually wait for his breathings in duty, what hope is there that profane men, and grievers of the ſpirit in walking contraire to God, his people, way and intereſt, (as are moſt Conformiſts) ſhould have the ſpirits ſeal attending their Miniſtry. What more? He tells us 4. *That ſometimes the ſpirit will act with the mean gifts more then the greater as Peter Acts 2. is found to have converted more in one ſermon, then we read that our Lord himſelf did, tho he ſpoke as never man ſpoke. That Chriſt oft complain'd of ſmall ſucceſs, Iſa. 49. 4. & 53. 1. & upbraided people for unbelief Math. 11. 21, 22, 23. Ioh. 5. 40. —— that after the ſermon on the mount we read not that many were converted tho they were aſtoniſht —— that the Centurions faith was commended above that of Iſrael: and from the eaſt and weſt many will ſit down with Abraham while the children of the kingdom are caſt out. Ans.* 1. He muſt grant that this argument, taken from the ſpirits working great things by ſmal means, will not plead for owning Presbyterian Miniſters, to whom many of his *Scioli Rabbies* impute weakneſs of gifts, becauſe they think that *aliunde* or upon other grounds, ſuch Miniſters are not in this caſe to be heard. Well then let him take home his argument as inſufficient, untill he prove that *hic & nunc* Conformiſts are to be heard rather then Nonconformiſts, and prove his groundleſs ſuppoſitions above mentioned (wherein he begs the queſtion) and diſprove our true ſuppoſitions above alſo rehearſed, or this argument will ſig-

nify Just nothing. 2. For his Instances, as this man would be sober in such comparisons, so we must tell him, ther's a great difference betwixt little, & no success, a Ministry *with small effects*; and a Ministry *palpably blasted as to any saving issue*; and betwixt *sincere designing of success*, *and mourning over the want of it*, making it a complaint (as our Lord wept over Jerusalems impenitency and disobedience) and the Ministers designing *himself*, and no such thing, and wanting this impression mentioned. Sure as it will be hard for him to point us to any of their constant hearers who have been converted by their Ministry, so it will be as hard to point out any of their preachers, who have the peoples spiritual profit for their design; or their unprofitableness as their burden & complaint to God. And since both these are conspicuous in Presbyterian Ministers, Its quickly resolved which of the two are standing in Gods counsel, and travelling in birth to beget souls by the gospel, and to have Christ formed in them. But he would have us *praying for Conformists*, *and laying aside prejudice*. *Ans.* I think we are Indeed called to lay aside *prejudice at their persons*, and to pray *for their repentance*; but to pray for *a blessing on their Ministry*, who are in such direct opposition to the Lords people, work, and Interest, were a mocking of God, and hardning them in their sin, and consequently hearing and receiving the ordinances from them as the Ministers of this Church were a strenght ning of their hands in their disobedience. Beside, will he allow people upon their praying for Presbyterian Ministers to hear them? I trow not, then it seems laying aside prejudice and praying for Curats, may consist with not hearing them. His next childish objection put into the mouth of his Doubter [*that tho some withdraw all will not*] is not worth the noticing. It were good for our Church

that

all her members did ſo underſtand their duty and obligatons, as to deny that ſubjection to Conformiſts which he pleads for. And that ſuch paſtours as they who deſtroy but feed not, had no flocks: For they have not brought back the ſtraying, nor heal'd the ſick &c. But he tells us, *he hath proved that none ought to withdraw.* How inſignificant his preceeding proofs are, hath been diſcovered, and if his enſueing be no better, Its certain that *Succeſſus defuit auſis*, and that he hath overſhote hismarke, in this undertaking.

The Doubter enquires next [what obligation lyes on him, to be an ordinary hearer in his own congregation.] In anſwer to which the *Informer* tells us firſt, *of our obligation ſhowen by him to maintain union, and of the Acts of the ancient Church, and our own.* Which I have already anſwered. Next, he tells us, *of the reciprocal obligation betwixt a Miniſter and his congregation which cannot be ſo eaſily broken; the Miniſter is to labour diligently and faithfully, among the people of his charge* Ezek. 33. 8. *Heb.* 13. 17. *the people of his charge are to attend his Miniſtry to eſteem him highly, and love him for his works ſake* Mal. 2. 7. 1 *Theſ.* 5. 11, 12. *Heb.* 13. 17. He asks *how we obey this charge, when we diſowne, diſcountenance, and turn our backs upon our Miniſters, and will not receive the Law from their mouth. Anſ.* That there is *a reciprocall tye betwixt a Miniſter and his flock,* is eaſily acknowledged: but the *Informer* forgot the main and neceſſary point here (to make this weapon ſtrike home, and the argument run ſtraight without a byaſs) viz. *What makes up this tye according to the Scripture pattern.* This he ſhould have condeſcended upon, and made it good in the caſe of Conformiſts, and then his arguing had been pertinent, and formidable to the Non-Conformiſts. But what will this poor general ſay, *that there is a reciprocal tye betwixt a Miniſter and his flock,* while he hath not made appear, what is the Scripture

foundation and *basis* of that tye,& but begs the question in the application thereof to his case. I suppose a Presbyterian Minister should plead this to warrand his officiating among his people, in opposition to the Curat incumbent, *that the people are bound to owne him as their Minister, because of this reciprocal tye: That the Scripture obligations* (mentioned by the Informer) *lyes on him to be faithfull and diligent, which while he is endeavouring* (*according to his duty, founded on his relation to his people*) *the people are therefore bound to attend on his* Ministrie *to esteem him, love him, receive the Law from him, and and not to discountenance nor discourage him by withdrawing to another.* Now let this man shew what he will answer to this pleading, and his argument will quickly evanish before his own answer; If he say that the tye is loosed, let him instruct *what that is which has in this case loosed it.* Sure neither the Magistrates violence, nor Prelatick censures, according to our Principles, and the Doctrine of sound divines, when this case is truely stated. And if this divine tye stand, what will he say? Will it not 1. follow (according to him,) that a Minister may be under a standing tye to his people, and they to their Minister, and yet the people for all this may not be obliged to hear him but another *hic & nunc*, and that warrantably, without hazard of disobedience to these Scriptures; and then he hath with his own hand cut the throat of his bare generall argument from *the reciprocal tye.* Sure in some cases *the tye* may stand, and yet the *actuall reciprocal exercise*, or obligation to the exercise of duties may be *hic & nunc* warrantably suspended in very many supposable cases as of Physicall impediments in the people and Minister, hostile invasion, Pestilence, Imprisonment &c. 2. If the *tye or relation* do stand, and likewise all things which *do immediatly dispose to the exercise of duty*, then the Prelatical incumbent is in this

this caſe an *intruder*, and not to be own'd. For I ſuppoſe he will not ſay, that a Presbyterian Miniſter might lawfully officiat in his own Pariſh, after the Curat is ſetled there, for this would quite croſs the ſcope of his Argument. Now the Queſtion betwixt the two competitors is, *which of them hath the prior lawfull, and ſtanding tye?* will he dare to deny, that Presbyterian miniſters had this; and ſince he cannot ſhew how it is looſed, nor prove it to be looſed, this argument will militat not for him, but againſt him.

Next, as for what he cites out of Mr Durham on Revel. pag. 105: 106. anent this tye, It is ſtill *extra oleas*, and nothing correſpondent to his purpoſe, untill he inſtruct that which is the *baſis* and foundation of this Relation *in the caſe of Conformiſts*, which he neither doth nor offers to do. Mr Durham ſpeaks „of a ſpe„cial delegation from Chriſt, of his ſpeciall warrand „and appointment to ſuch a man to treat with ſuch a „flock. Now ſure this moſt be inſtructed from his Word and Teſtament, as to Curats, before he can from this make any ſhew of Argument. For Presbyterian miniſters do upon better ground lay claim to this ſpecial appointment in relation to their flocks, upon which conformiſts have intruded: yet this man thinks theſe miniſters are not to be owned. And ſince this deputation and appointment is, with Mr Durham, the foundation of the duty betwixt miniſter and people, it muſt be cleard from the word in the caſe of Conformiſts, before this paſſage of Mr Durham will afford any patrociny to his cauſe. Then he tells us, *That Mr Durham holds that this obligation is not founded on meer voluntary conſent.* Well let him mark this, and then he muſt acknowledge, that its not meerly the *Curats gaping conſent for the fleece and filthy Lucre*, nor

the peoples *blind consent*, that will make them *Ministers of these Congregations where they officiat*. What is it then that founds this relation? The *Scripture-commands* (saith Mr Durham) 1. *Thes.* 5. 12. *Know them that labour among you and are over you in the Lord. Heb* 13. 14. *Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit your selves, for they watch for your souls as they that must give account, &c.* But will this man deny that Mr Durham speaks upon the supposition of the Minister his having the Ministerial call and mission according to the rule of the Word, to ground his pleading these Scripture commands, and his special commission to such a people: And that he look't upon *the Presbyteries mission, and ordination, and the peoples call*, together with *due qualifications*, and the visible evidences of Christs call in the person thus admitted, as the foundation of this special relation to such a flock, according to the Scripture pattern, and the order and Government of this Church then established. I durst pose his conscience upon the truth of this; and whether Mr Durham did ever dream of a speciall relation to a flock in this Church, *resulting from a Prelates mission in a Method of perjury, in opposition to our Covenant and sworn reformation, without the mission and ordination of a Presbytry, or the peoples call, and in a way of intrusion upon the charges of faithfull Ministers violently thrust out by persecuting Prelats*, the men thus obtruded being for most part such as have nothing that may ground a reasonable or charitable construction of them, that they are *sent of God*, but palpable evidences of the contrary, While in the mean time the faithfull Ministers are willing to cleave to their flocks, and the flocks to them? If he say that all the Ministers he pleads for are not such. I Answer, he makes no limitation of this Argument, but pleads the forementiond Scriptures, and Mr Durham's Testimony universally, and tells us in the next page, *that*

*Mr*

*Mr Durham binds the people fast to the Ministers of their own congregations by this discourse*, he means to the Ministry of all the Conformists. As for that passage of Mr Durham's Testimony after cited by him *anent the Sympathy betwixt Ministers and flocks, and the reckoning that will be made in relation to mutuall duties.* We think it pleads very strongly for that Sympathy that ought now to be betwixt Presbyterian Ministers and their flocks, which Conformists have usurped upon, and the mutuall performing of duty to each other upon all hazards, in opposition to the Curats intrusion. And if Paul aggreaged particularly the Gentiles slighting and grieving him, by his particular delegation to them, which was, even as to the Apostle himself, by the imposition of the hands of the Presbytry Act. 13. 13. Presbyterian Ministers delegation to their flocks, which was in this manner, must needs stand, and may be much better pleaded upon this ground then that of Curats Who are sent to flocks by Prelats as their own underlings, and have nothing like Pauls delegation in their mission. So that Mr Durhams arguments, and the Scriptures cited by him, are so far from *tying congregations to conformists*, as this man alleages, that they tye them *to their own faithfull Presbyterian pastours*, and by consequence to disowne prelats and their intruding hirelings, as none of the lawfull Pastours of this Church.

I might here add that the account of the Pastours duty, and the ground of the people's subjection and obedience exhibit to us in these scriptures which he mentions, doth sufficiently exclude their party from any claim therunto. What? *do they hear Gods word and warn the people from him*, who are generally so ignorant of his word walking contrary to it themselves, and hardning others in rebellion against him? are they *watching for souls as they that must give account?*

who are loving to sleep and slumber; and dare not say most of them, that ever they enquird at any soul how it is betwixt God and them? *do their lips keep knowledge*, who have departed out of the way, and caused many stumble at the Law? are they *labouring and admonishing as to sin and duty*, who are ringleaders in a course of defection? Sure if the duties of subjection, reverence, and obedience, suppose such characters of Ministers, and such qualifications as are here expresst, people are hereby abundantly discharged from such subjection and obedience as to Conformists, who are so palpably destitute of these qualifications. So that the *Informer* falls utterly short of his intended advantage by this citation of Mr Durham, and the scriptures therin mentioned do wound his cause to death, and cut the sinews of his reasoning. This man is so unhappy as to fall still by the rebound of his own arguments, and the scripture-weapons (which in pleading for this cause will never be found the weapons of his warfare) wounds him every time he handles them: which as it hath before, so it shall presently appear further, in some more of his arguments and answers upon this point, which we now present.

---

## Chap. III.

*The Doubters argument* from Curats not entring by a call from the people, *and that passage Acts* 14. 23. *cleared and improven.* The Informers *exceptions upon the terme* χειροτονήσαντες *fully examined, and the peoples right in the call of Pastours cleared therfrom.* His reasonings

*ſonings about* Patronages, *and the prelatick ordination, and peoples diſowning of Scandalous Miniſters not cenſured. As alſo his great argument from Math.* 23. 1. *and the owning of the Temple-worship, ſcanned and retorted upon him. Mr Durham in this point pleads nothing for the* Informer. *His anſwers and reaſonings anent the charge of* Introſion *examined.*

Our *Informer* upon this point of *ſeparation* (which he holds to be his fort-royal in the preſent differences) having plyed his Doubter with offenſive weapons, will needs ſhew his skill and juſt dealing in acting the defendant for ſome time. But I doubt that his defenſive armour and anſwers ſhall be found as thin and penetrable in this debate, as his impugning weapons are blunt and pointleſs. Well, this fair diſputant, will hear ſome of our arguments againſt the owning of Conformiſts, but be ſure they muſt be of his own mould and digeſting, for theſe can beſt ſuit the deſign of that pretty piece of pageantry, which he is acting in this pamphlet. The firſt argument which his Doubter offers, is [their not entring by a call from the people as all Miniſters ſhould (citing Act. 14. 23.) but by a preſentation from the patron.] In anſwer to this, he ſpends ſome diſcourſe upon that text, which we ſhall examine. But to clear this point the more fully, I will premiſe three things. 1. That the people have a divine right to call their paſtour, we proved before in the 9th argument againſt Epiſcopacy, and from other ſcripture-grounds beſide this, although it be a weighty ground alſo, unto this we refer the reader. 2. That upon ſuppoſal of this divine rule and pattern of a Miniſters Lawfull call, it doth clear-

ly

ly follow, that the *patronages* are a corruption, rendring the Miniſters call in this reſpect maimed, and not ſo conſonant to ſcripture as it ought to be.

3. Though it be granted that a Miniſter preſented by the Patron, and not called by the people, hath *the eſſence of the Miniſterial office*, and might in ſome caſes be owned as a Miniſter, yet this will plead nothing for the owning of Curats as the caſe is now circumſtantiat: Becauſe 1. Its certain that according to the principles and reformation of this Church, as eſtabliſht before theſe innovations, a Miniſters entry by impoſition of the hands of the Presbytery, without the uſurping Prelate, and by the call of the people without the Patron, is *the more pure and ſcriptural way of entry into the Miniſtry*; and moreover *the only way of entry own'd and authorized by her ſupreme Iudicatories*, and by conſequence its moſt ſuitable to Presbyterian principles, when there is a competition betwixt the one and the other, and Miniſters thus Lawfully called, are violently ejected by men reeſtabliſhing prelacy, and patronages, formerly caſt out and vowed againſt, that people do adhere to their faithfull paſtours rather then theſe Innovators and intruders; which will be convincingly clear, if it be alſo conſidered particularly, that as prelacy & allits corruptions & uſurpations now exiſtent and introduced, were fully removed and abjured by this Church, ſo *laick patronages* in ſpeciall were upon moſt weighty grounds removed by the parliament 1649. in correſpondence to our Churches declarator as appears in the Narrative of their 39. act. viz. *The ſenſe of the obligation lying upon them, both by the National and ſolemn league & covenant, by many deliverances and mercies from God, & by the late ſolemn engadgement to duties, to preſerve the doctrine and to maintain and vindicat the liberties of the Church of Scotland — to advance the work of Reformation —— and conſidering that*

*that patronages & persentations of Kirkes is an evill and bondage under which the Lords people & Ministers of this land have long groan'd. That it hath no warrand in Gods word, but is founded only on the Canon Law, that it is a popish custom brought into this Church in time of ignorance & superstition, that its contrary to the 2d book of discipline, wherein upon solid grounds its reckon'd among abuses that are desired to be reformed, and Contrary to several acts of general assemblies, prejudicial to the liberty of the people, and planting of Churches, to the free call and entry of Ministers to their charge &c.* This act the parliament 1662 did ranverse among other pieces of our Reformation: *Ordaining all Ministers that entered since 49. to have no right to the benefice, till they obtain a presentation from the Lawfull Patron, and collation from the Bishop.* Now upon supposal of the Covenant obligation, and our engadgement therein to separat from any corruption contrary to our Reformation, to give a testimony to that work, to with-draw from backsliders, is there any doubt but that people are oblidged (upon these grounds) to adhere to that body of faithful Ministers, who are standing to our principles and sworn Reformation (whereof these points mentioned are one main piece) rather then such as have turn'd aside to this course of perjurious defection. Sure our obligations mentioned do every way include Presbyterian Ministers, & exclude Conformists. Presbyterian Ministers are maintaining the peoples right and liberty to call their pastour, Conformists are selling away this peice of her reformation & liberty, and thus crossing the scripture-pattern, the first are adhering to this Churches vowes (and people are obliged to owne these Ministers that are pursuing the ends) the other are casting them away &c. Again 3. all the motives mentioned in the premised act of parliament, and in our Churches publick acts in opposition to patronages, and prelatick usurpations in a Ministers entry,

entry, are ſtill binding and in force, according to our principles, as the *Informer* will not for very ſhame deny, and he muſt admit this ſuppoſition ſince in this point he profeſſeth to argue againſt us upon our own principles, and ſo what did then engadge *to reſtore* this peice of our Churches libertie and Reformation, the ſame doth now bind *to adhere therunto*, and conſequently to owne the Miniſters that contend for this Reformation rather then the backſliders and deſerters thereof.

4. This man dare not aſſert, that the granting conformiſts *to have the eſſence of a Miniſterial call*, will in every caſe infer the concluſion *of hearing them*, or that the granting a Miniſter to have this, is *the only & adequat ground* which will in all circumſtantiat caſes make hearing neceſſary. For 1. What if he be violently obtruded by a part of the congregation upon the previouſly call'd Miniſter his labours, to whom the people ſtand oblig'd to adhere? Again 2. What if he be promoting a Schiſmatick courſe, ſetting up an altar againſt an altar (as ſome of theſe men tell us in their Pamphlets) will a people croſs their principles as to his having *the eſſence of a Miniſteriall call*, if they refuſe to follow him in that Schiſmatick courſe? Nay he will not ſay it. 3. What will our *Informer* anſwer to *Presbyterian Miniſters plea* for peoples adherence to them upon *their lawful call, miſſion, and entry* to their charges? will this infer a neceſſity of *the people's owning them, and deſerting conformiſts*? If it will not (as he muſt here ſay, or yeeld the cauſe) then he muſt confeſs, that *acknowledgment of the eſſence of Curats call*, will not abſulutely plead *for hearing them* untill before the Scripture barr, and by the conſtitutions and reformation of this Church, they can prove their claim to be better then that of Presbyterian Miniſters to officiat as her true Paſtours, which will be *ad Kalendas Græcas*; & whatever he can pretend here, as to diſow-

diſowning of Presbyterian Miniſters in their adminiſtrations, notwithſtanding of their having *a lawfull call*, and paſtoral relation to this Church, will be eaſily retorted upon himſelf, and abundantly counterballanced by that which in the caſe of conformiſts may be pleaded to ſuperſede, and ſtop the peoples owning of them in this circumſtantiat poſture of our Church. So that the ſtate of the queſtion here being this, *whether Miniſters ordained by Biſhops, and preſented by Patrons, or thoſe who are ordained by the Presbytry, and called by the people, have beſt right to officiat in this Church, as her Paſtours, according to the Scripture-rule, her reformation and principles, and to be own'd or diſown'd by the people accordingly.* The deciſion will be very eaſy and favourable to Presbyterian Miniſters, and excluſive of all his fraternity. And whatever he doth here alledge anent Presbyterian Miniſters ſchiſm, intruſion, or diſorder, will be eaſily retorted upon himſelf, *reputando rem in univerſum & ab initio.* Or tracing matters to their true originals. But now what ſayes our *Informer* to this argument of his Doubter, as he ſlenderly propones it to make it foordable. 1. *He tells us that ſundry whom we refuſe to hear, entred by the peoples call.* But tho it were granted that ſuch might be heard, who are but a few, how will this plead for all the reſt, and looſe his Doubters argument as to them? 2. We told him that its not *the want of the peoples call, ſimply and abſtractedly from the circumſtances of our caſe,* that we ground upon in diſowning them, no more then it is *Presbyterian Miniſters want of an Epiſcopal ordination* which he pleads ſimply *as the ground of diſowning them*: But our ground is their ſtanding all of them in a direct ſtated oppoſition to the Reformation, union, and order of this Church, and driving on an intereſt and deſign tending to overturn it, and by conſequence being lyable to her higheſt cenſures; and likewiſe

their

their perſecuting and oppoſing faithful Miniſters contending for her Reformation. 3. All thoſe who he alledges entered by the peoples call, havng by their conformity to this Prelacy and Eraſtianiſm, *diſowned their firſt entry in this manner*, and obtained preſentation from Patrons, and collation from prelats, according to their new acts and orders, are now of the ſame ſtamp with the reſt, as to their principles and carriage, and conſequently the peoples diſowning them upon the fore-mentioned grounds in this our caſe, falls under the ſame obligations with their diſowning others, and the rather becauſe *their apoſtacy* is an aggravation of their guilt. But now what ſayes our *Informer* to this text Acts. 14. 23. which is brought by his Doubter to prove the peoples right in the election of Paſtours. He grants, *that the word χειροτονήσαντες is borrowed from the cuſtom uſed in ſome of the ancient Greek ſtates, where the people ſignifyed their election of Magiſtrats, by the ſtretching forth of their hands, becauſe the word ſo ſignifies.* Well, what then hath he to quarrell at in this argument, for the peoples right in the call of Miniſters from this text? 1. He tells us *that Doctor Hamond and other Criticks ſhew, that the word is oftenuſed by writters to expreſs the action of one ſingle perſon, as its taken by Luke Acts* 10. 41. *Speaking of Gods chuſing or appointing, So that the word is not neceſſarly to be underſtood of the action of many chſiurg by ſuffrages. Anſ.* That the Greek Word in its ordinary and conſtant acceptation doth import, and is made uſe of to ſignify a chuſing by ſuffrages, and lifting up or extending the hands, Presbyterian Writers have proven from a full conſent of Criticks, Interpreters, and the beſt Greeck authors. The Syriack verſion ſhewes that the word is not to be underſtood of the Apoſtles ordination of Elders, but of *the Churches election of Elders* in rendering the text thus, *Moreover they made to them*

*themſelves*, that is, the diſciples mentioned in the former verſe, made to themſelves, (for ſuch as were made, were not Elders or Miniſters to *Paul & Barnabas, but to the multitude of the diſciples*) in every Church *while they were faſting with them & praying, & commending them &c.* Which election could not be but after the Grecian form by the Churches lifting up, or ſtretching out of hands, thus Mr Gilleſp. Miſc. queſt. page 9. Who alſo cleares this from Criticks and Interpreters aſſerting this ſenſe of the word. He ſhews that where *Julius Pollux* hath χειροτονια lib. 2. cap. 4. *Gualther* and *Wolf Siberus* render it *manuum extenſio*, and that Budæus interprets the word *plebiſcitum, ſuffragium, H. Stephanus, manum porrigo.* Becauſe (he ſaith) they did in giving votes χειροτονειν thence the word came to be uſed, for *ſciſco, decerno, creo. Iuſtin. Martyr. Queſt. & Reſp. ad orthod.* 1 *Reſp. ad queſt.* 14. diſtinguiſhes χειροτονια and χειροθεσια as of a different ſignification. Arrias Montanus in his lexicon, doth interpret this word *manum elevare, eligere, creare Magiſtratum per ſuffragia.* Again 2. The manner of election among the grecians clears this metaphore, & ſignification of the word. *Demoſth. Cicero* and others make this appear; they had a phraſe χειροτονια παντι, *omnium ſuffragijs, obtinet*, and another phraſe ουδεις αντεχειροτονησεν, *no man gives a contrary vote.* The approving votes, in chuſing Grecian Magiſtrats in the theatre, was by holding up, or ſtretching forth of hands. See page 10. 11. 12. Where this is learndly and at large made good. 3. This is alſo made good from the ordinary method wherin the ſcriptures do expreſs the ſetting apart of Church officers to their ſacred functions, which is by the Churches election and conſent, ſee 1 Cor. 16. 3. 2 Cor. 8. 19. 1 Tim. 3. 7. Acts 1. 23, 26. and 13. 3. and 15. 22. And ſince the holy ghoſt doth here intend by Luke to expreſs the manner of the eſtabliſhment of Elders, it is utterly improbable that

the churches ſuffrage ſhould be here omitted. 4. Proteſtant writers draw the Churches ſuffrage in election of Miniſters, from this word, *Magd. Cent. 1. lib. 2. cap. 6. Zanch. in 4. precept.* So *Beza, Bullinger decad. 5. Serm. 4. Iunius contrav 5. lib. cap. 7. Gerard. Tom. 6. pag. 95. Danæus* 1 *Tim. 5. Wallæus in his treatiſe quibuſnam competit vocatio paſtorum. Cartwright, againſt the Rhemiſts*, objecting (with our Informer) *That in ſcripture this word ſignifies impoſition of hands*, anſwereth, *That its abſurd to imagine, that the holy Ghoſt by Luke ſpeaking with the tongues of men, and to their underſtanding ſhould uſe a word in that ſignification, in which it was never uſed before his time, in any writter holy or profane. For how could he be underſtood* (ſaith he) *if uſing the note and name, he had fled from the ſignification whereto they uſed it, therefore unleſs he purpoſed to write what none could underſtand or read, it muſt needs be that as he wrote, ſo he meant election by voices.* Then he proves this from *Oecumenius* the greek ſcholiaſt, from the Greek *Ignatius*, and tells us, *there were proper words to ſignify the laying on of hands, had the holy ghoſt intended this, and that its abſurd to thinke that Luke, who ſtraitneth himſelf to keep the words of the ſeventie Interpreters, when he could have uttered things in better terms then they did, ſhould here forſake the phraſe wherewith they noted the laying on of hands, being moſt proper and natural to ſignify the ſame.* Next, As for what he objects from Acts 10. 41. had he been ſincere or diligent in this debate, he might have found that the above mentioned learned Presbyterian writer with others doth here tell him firſt, that the word προχειροτονια uſed there, is not the ſame with χειροθεσια, but is as it were a preventing of χειροτονια by a prior deſignation. 2. That its atribute to God *metaphorice* or improperly, ſhewing that in the council of God, the Apoſtles were in a manner elected by voices in the trinity, which he clears by that parallel Gen. 1. *Let* [us] *make man.*

Adding

Adding, *that this hinders no more the proper signification of the word, when applyed to men, then* μετεμελειτο *ascribed to God can prove, that there's no change in men, when they repent, because there is none in God.*

The Informers 2d answer is, *That Greek writers do ordinarly use this word to signify ordaining a person to a charge, without voices and suffrages.* And that here its so to be understood, he proves from this, that *Paul and Barnabas are said to do this work expresst by this Greek word, and not the people; That we will not say that Paul and Barnabas elected Ministers to these Churches, which were to yeeld the question. That therefore our translation reads it, they that is Paul and Barnabas, ordained them elders &c. they pray'd and commended them to the Lord; So that it was not the action of the people, but of Paul and Barnabas. Ans.* All this is nothing but his *petio principii* and what is answered already 1. That this word signifies ordinarly the ordaining of a Person to a charge without votes and suffrages, is most false, and contrary to the sense of the word in Greek authors', contrary to the Scripture acceptation of the word, & to sound divines as we have heard. And to this may be here added (which is also the observation of the above mentioned learn'd writters) that we find extraordinary Officers in the Apostles times not put into their functions without the Churches consent, hence we may conclude, that far less ought there to be an intrusion of ordinary Ministers without their consent. Paul & Silas were chosen of the whole Church to their extraordinary delegation, Acts. 15. 22. Pauls company were chosen by the Church 2 Cor. 18. 19. The Commissioners of Corinth were approved by the Church 1 Cor 16. 3. Matthias an Apostle, συγκατεψηφισθη *simul suffragiis electus est*, as Arrias Montanus turn's it, *was together chosen by suffrages.* viz. of the 120 Disciples. 2. How prove's he that Paul and and Barnabas did this work expresst by

this word χειροτονια, we told him that the Syriack Version understands it of the Disciples. Mr Gillespy (loco citato) proves that αυτοις is here to be rendred *ipsis* not *illis*, shewing that Pasor in the word χειροτονεω renders Acts 14. 23. *quumque ipsis per suffragia creassent presbyteros*; so saith he αυτοις is for εαυτοις, which he proves because the Greeks use the one word sometimes for the other, as he clears from Scripture parallels. So he thus sense-eth the verse and context, *the Churches of Lystra, Iconium and Antioch, after chusing of Elders who were also solemnly set apart with prayer and fasting, were willing to let Paul and Barnabas go from them to the planting and watering of other Churches, and commended them to God to open to them an effectuall door*, Eph. 6. 18, 19. *or for their safetie and preservation Luk.* 23. 46. Again, what inconsistency with our sense of the word χειροτονιν will it be, if all that is mentioned in the 23. verse be taken as joint acts of Paul & Barnabas, and of the Churches together with them, viz. *That they all concurr'd in making them Elders by suffrage, and in prayer and fasting, and commending themselves to the Lord.* 3. How proves he, that the relative [they] in our translation is referred to *Paul and Barnabas only*, rather then *the Churches*? sure, this is a blind proof, and (as we use to say) a *Baculo ad angulum*; *they ordain'd elders*: Ergo *Paul and Barnabas only ordain'd by Imposition of hands*; since the word χειροτονια, or την χειρα τιθημι as its resolved by the learned, cannot hardly in propriety of speech import *laying on of hands in ordination*, which was proper to Paul and Barnabas; and the *Septuagint* whom *Luke* followes, expressing the laying on of hands by επιθεσις των χειρων Our *Informer* must acknowledge this from the sequel of his own reasoning, for he tells us, *that Paul and Barnabas could not elect Ministers*, very true, and therefore the χειροτονια which in its native acceptation signifies *election by suffrage*, as he hath acknowledged, must relate *to the*

*the people*; Since there could be no hand-ſuffrage betwixt Paul and Barnabas 4. Giving and not granting that this was an act of Paul and Barnabas, diſtinct from the Churches ſuffrage, our argument ſtands good and this will not in the leaſt yeeld the queſtion as this man fooliſhly imagines; for to read it thus, *Paul and Barnabas ordained elders by ſuffrage*, is all one with this, that *they ordained ſuch to be elders as were choſen by the Chuch.* The people declared by hand-ſuffrage whom they would have to be Elders, and Paul and Barnabas ordained them Elders: As the *Conſul* who held the court among the Romans, created new Magiſtrats, that is, did receive the votes and preſide in the elections. Since (as I ſaid) the hand-ſuffrage cannot in any propriety of ſpeech relate to Paul and Barnabas alone. See *Calvines Inſtitut. lib. 4. cap. 53. paragr. 15. and Mr Gilleſp. ubi ſupra*, who further tells us, *that this may be either an action of the Church only, as the Syriack makes it, or a joint action both of the Churches and of Paul and Barnabas, as Junius makes it, or an action of Paul and Barnabas in this ſenſe, that they did conſtitute elders to the Churches by the Churches own voices, in all which ſenſes χειροτονια ſtands good for us.* To which we may add, that Calvine renders the word *cum ſuffragiis creaſſent, when the had made by votes.* Adding, *that Paul and Barnabas ordained Miniſters to the Churches, for they did preſide over, and moderat the people's election. Presbyteros dicuntur eligere Paulus & Barnabas an ſoli hoc privato officio faciunt quum potius rem permittunt omnium ſuffragiis: Ergo in Paſtoribus creandis libera fuit populi electio, ſed ne quid tumultuoſe fieret, præſidens Paulus & Barnabas quaſi Moderatores.* That is, *Paul and Barnabas are ſaid to chuſe Elders, but do they this ſolely and by themſelves, and do not rather remit this to the ſuffrages of all, therefore in the making of Paſtours the people had a free election and choiſe, but leſt any thing ſhould be done tumultuouſly*

Paul

*Paul and Barnabas do preside as Moderatours.* So he sayes we are to understand the decree of the *Council of Laodicea*, which seemed to inhibit the people's elections.

The Dutch Annot. upon this passage do tell us, „that „this was a custome among the Greeks in chusing their „Magistrats, that the people by lifting up their hands „give to understand their voting, so it seems that from „thence this custome was also used in the primitive „Church, that the setting forth of Ministers of the „Church, being done by Apostles or those that were „sent by them for this purpose, was approved by the „Church by the lifting up of their hands; which use „long continued in the Church; as the Eccleſiastick hi„stories testify. And having told us that others understand this of imposition of hands (which they set down as the secondary and less probable opinion) they add, „that this also was done with consent of the church „as appears by the fasting and praying which was done „by the whole Congregation, and was also done in „this chusing of the Elders, referring to 1 Tim. 5.17. „Acts 10. 41. upon which passage they shew, that the „Greek word in Acts 14. 23. signifies properly by lifting up of hands to choose or ordain, and is here used „concerning the chooſing of ordinary Ministers by the „suffrages of the Church, to which this extraordinary „chooſing of Apostles is here opposed, as being done „by lifting up or stretching forth of Gods hand alone. „Upon Acts. 6. 6. where mention is made of laying on „of hands, they tells us, that as this was usual in blessing „Gen. 48. 14. in sacrifices Lev. 1. 4. and in installing „into offices Numb. 27. 18. Deut 34. 9. So the Church „(pointing at the Apostolick Churches practice) in in„vestiture of Ministers, did thus dedicate them to God „his service, and used thus to wish his blessing 1 Tim. 5. 22. The English annot. upon this text under de-

bate

bate do ſhew, „that the word ſignifies making of ſuch „ a choiſe, as was made or confirmed by lifting up of „ hands, to ſignify ſuffrages or conſent, and having „ told us of the general ſignification of the word in re„ference to ordination or appointing chap. 10. 41. they „ add, that the Syriack reads the text thus, [and they „ appointed to them Elders in every Congregation.] „ Whence they collect that Paul and Barnabas did not „ all alone in ordaining & Church-government; other „ Chriſtians ſhew'd their conſent or approbation of the „ perſons who were ordained Elders by lifting up their „ hands; as very weel knowing, of what behaviour „ they had been among them: ſo χειροτονεω ſignifies „ (ſay they) to diſallow by ſome act, election, or decree. „ Adding, that *Suidas* interprets χειροτονια by ἐκλογὴ which „ his Interpreter renders *electio, delectus, per ſuffragia con„firmatio, populi totius conſenſus*, an *election*, *chooſing*, & „ *confirmation by voices*, *conſent of all the people*. Let our *Informer* here obſerve 1. That the chooſing of Miniſters by ſuffrage, and conſent of the Church, is imported and held out in this paſſage under debate, in the conſentient judgment of Interpreters, and that this greek word, as in its ordinary, ſo its ſpecial acceptation in this place, will clearly infer ſo much, whatever authority in ordination and election as to Paul and Barnabas, and of Miniſters conſequently, the circumſtances of this text will bear out and infer. 2. That this intereſt of the people in the election and call of Miniſters is comprobate by the judgement and conſentient practice of the ancient Church, as the hiſtory therof doth verify. 3. That that paſſage Act. 10. 41. doth (in their ſenſe) nothing invalidate this right of the people, held out in this text, the one place ſpeaking of an immediat chooſing by God, the other of mediat and ordinary by men, the one, pointing at ordination and appointing of the Apoſtles to

their office in a general ſenſe, the other of the ſpecial or ſpecifical mould of the call and election of Miniſters. 4. That this right and intereſt of the people in Miniſters call, as it is founded upon the ancient practice and unrepealed priviledge of Gods Church under the old Teſtament, ſo it hath beſides this, and ſuch like inſtances, and exemplary recommendations of the new-teſtament, a conſtant moral warrand *of the peoples knowledge anent the eaſe and behaviour of their ſpiritual guides.*

His 3d anſwer to this text is, *That if we underſtand it of a hand ſuffrage we loſe by it.* Why ſo? *becauſe we give advantadge to the Independents for popular election of Miniſters whereas we give this power not to all the people, but to the ſeſſion.* And he tells us, *that therefore underſtanding Presbyterians have forborn to preſs this text. Anſ.* 1. We have proven that a congregational Elderſhip is *Juris divini*, & that by conſequence this election ſtrictly taken muſt be their priviledge, See 9 Argument againſt Prelacy on the 1. Dialogue. Who theſe underſtanding Presbyterians are, who do not underſtand this place as warranding the people's intereſt in the election & call of Miniſters, the *Informer* hath not given us an account, ſince his Doubter is none of them, and if he mean the Authors of *jus divinum Miniſterii Evangelici*, he will finde that they do clearly aſſert this truth (*propoſ.* 1.) ſo as it do not exclude the due right of Miniſters herein. See pag. 127. and 129. And the Aſſembly of divines in their directory for ordination of Miniſters 4. Branch, do require *the people's conſent and approbation*, as neceſſarily antecedaneous to the ordination. Beſides, could the *Informer* be ignorant that there are ſeveral other weighty Scripture grounds & arguments pleaded by our writters to fortify this right of the people; why did he not then put theſe alſo into the mouth of his Doubter, and give us an account of his own, and his Epiſco-

Episcopal Masters' skill in dissolving them? Moreover tho it were granted, that all here did concurr in this suffrage where no Eldership was yet constitute (as Mr Gillespy Judgeth probable miscell. pag. 14.) it will nothing infringe the power of the Eldership in Churches constitute, there being a vast difference betwixt the *modus rei*, in Churches constitute, and these *in fieri* or that are to be constitute. Again 2. We told him that the word imports a *judicial suffrage* by extending of hands, and that *in committiis*, among courts, senats, and representatives of the people, as in the Roman senate, in which the Consuls presided. And that among the Greeks χειροτονητὸς is the Magistrat created by suffrages, in the courts solemnly held for that purpose. That the Roman senate did χειροτονειν τους θεους as Chrysostome saith, which Doctor Potter expones, *made their Gods by suffrage* (*Charity mistaken page* 145.) Again, supposing Elderships here existent, this phrase may be well referr'd to the people, as importing their consent and approbation, reserving still to the Eldership their Juridical suffrage, and decisive vote in election. Mr *Gillespy* (*ubi supra*) clears this, shewing *that in Athens it selfe the people did* χειροτονειν, *when they did but like well the persons nominated, as when a Thesaurer offered some to be surety* ους αν ὁ δημος χειροτονησῃ, *whom the people shall approve. This he proves from Demosth. adverss. Timocr.* from which oration he makes it good, *that the* εκκλησια *the Assembly, and* δικαστηριον, *the court of Judges, are plainly distinguished so far, that they might not be both upon one day; and that tho the people did* χειροτονειν, *yet not they but the* ηλιασται, *or judges did* καθιστανται αρχην, *ordain or appoint a Magistrat.* In a word, we give in this mater [the Ministers call] the *suffrage and election* to the *Eldership* (I mean in a Church constitute) and *the consent* (which is distinct from *the decisive voice* as the learned acknowledge, *Ga-*

their office in a general ſenſe, the other of the ſpecial or ſpecifical mould of the call and election of Miniſters. 4. That this right and intereſt of the people in Miniſters call, as it is founded upon the ancient practice and unrepealed priviledge of Gods Church under the old Teſtament, ſo it hath beſides this, and ſuch like inſtances, and exemplary recommendations of the new-teſtament, a conſtant moral warrand *of the peoples knowledge anent the caſe and behaviour of their ſpiritual guides.*

His 3d anſwer to this text is, *That if we underſtand it of a hand ſuffrage we loſe by it.* Why ſo? *becauſe we give advantadge to the Independents for popular election of Miniſters whereas we give this power not to all the people, but to the ſeſſion.* And he tells us, *that therefore underſtanding Presbyterians have forborn to preſs this text. Anſ.* 1. We have proven that a congregational Elderſhip is *Juris divini*, & that by conſequence this election ſtrictly taken muſt be their priviledge, See 9 Argument againſt Prelacy on the 1. Dialogue. Who theſe underſtanding Presbyterians are, who do not underſtand this place as warranding the people's intereſt in the election & call of Miniſters, the *Informer* hath not given us an account, ſince his Doubter is none of them, and if he mean the Authors of *jus divinum Miniſterii Evangelici*, he will finde that they do clearly aſſert this truth (*propoſ.* 1.) ſo as it do not exclude the due right of Miniſters herein. See pag. 127. and 129. And the Aſſembly of divines in their directory for ordination of Miniſters 4. Branch, do require *the people's conſent and approbation*, as neceſſarily antecedaneous to the ordination. Beſides, could the *Informer* be ignorant that there are ſeveral other weighty Scripture grounds & arguments pleaded by our writters to fortify this right of the people; why did he not then put theſe alſo into the mouth of his Doubter, and give us an account of his own, and his Epiſco-

Epiſcopal Maſters skill in diſſolving them? Moreover tho it were granted, that all here did concurr in this ſuffrage where no Elderſhip was yet conſtitute (as Mr Gilleſpy Judgeth probable miſcell. pag. 14.) it will nothing infringe the power of the Elderſhip in Churches conſtitute, there being a vaſt difference betwixt the *modus rei*, in Churches conſtitute, and theſe *in fieri* or that are to be conſtitute. Again 2. We told him that the word imports a *judicial ſuffrage* by extending of hands, and that *in comitiis*, among courts, ſenats, and repreſentatives of the people, as in the Roman ſenate, in which the Conſuls preſided. And that among the Greeks χειροτονητος is the Magiſtrat created by ſuffrages, in the courts ſolemnly held for that purpoſe. That the Roman ſenate did χειροτονειν τους θεους as Chryſoſtome ſaith, which Doctor Potter expones, *made their Gods by ſuffrage* (*Charity miſtaken page* 145.) Again, ſuppoſing Elderſhips here exiſtent, this phraſe may be well referr'd to the people, as importing their conſent and approbation, reſerving ſtill to the Elderſhip their Juridical ſuffrage, and deciſive vote in election. *Mr Gilleſpy* (*ubi ſupra*) clears this, ſhewing *that in Athens it ſelfe the people did* χειροτονειν, *when they did but like well the perſons nominated, as when a Theſaurer offered ſome to be ſurety* ους αν ὁ δημος χειροτονηση, *whom the people ſhall approve. This he proves from Demoſth. adverſ. Timocr.* from which oration he makes it good, *that the* εκκλησια *the Aſſembly, and* δικαστηριον, *the court of Judges, are plainly diſtinguished ſo far, that they might not be both upon one day; and that tho the people did* χειροτονειν, *yet not they but the* ηλιασαι, *or judges did* καθιστασαι αρχην, *ordain or appoint a Magiſtrat.* In a word, we give in this mater [the Miniſters call] the *ſuffrage and election* to the *Elderſhip* (I mean in a Church conſtitute) and *the conſent* (which is diſtinct from *the deciſive voice* as the learned acknowledge, *Ga-*

*machæus in primam 2dæ our of Thomas queſt.* 15 ſhewes this) to the *whole people*, and the *formal authoritative miſſion*, and *impoſition of hands*, making the man a Miniſter, and giving him the ἐξουσία who had it not before, to *the Presbytery*, according to the Scripture pattern; which is *toto cœlo* different from the Independents principles in this point.

If any object that the giving the ſuffrage and election of Miniſters to the Elderſhip, excluding the people, makes the breach greater betwixt the Independents and us then needs, it being ſufficient to clear us from their principles, that we allow not either to the Elderſhip or congregation, the formal authoritative miſſion and impoſition of hands. And that our arguments upon this head ſeems to give to the people not onely conſent, but ſuffrage in election. I ſhall deſire firſt, that Mr Gilleſpies anſwer be conſidered (Miſcell. page 24.) to an objection about our homologating with Independents in this point. Who ſayes „ that in this „ point of election we do not homologate with them, „ who give to the collective body of the Church (wo- „ men and children under age onely excepted) the po- „ wer of deciſive vote or ſuffrage in elections, we give „ the vote *onely to the Eldership* or Church repreſentative, „ ſo that they carry along with them the conſent of the „ *major* or better part of the congregation. So that he „ makes the attributing of this deciſive voice & ſuffrage „ in elections, *unto the people*, to be downright Indepen- „ dency & the march ſtone of their difference from us. „ He tells us afterward, that *the conſent and knowledge* be- „ longs to the *whole Church* without which Miniſters may „ not be intruded, & *the counſel and deliberation*, (which is „ diſtinct from this conſent) to the ableſt & wiſeſt of the „ congregation, eſpecially *the Magiſtrates*. But he diſtin- „ guiſhes from both theſe the *deciſive vote in Court or judi- „ catory*, & the *formal conſiſtorial determination* in the caſe of election,

„ election, and this he ſayes, belongs onely unto, and „ conſiſts in, *the votes of the* Eldership. And that the „ Independents contrarily give the *conference and delibe-* „ *ration* to the Elderſhip (as we uſe to do in Comittees) „ but *the deciſion* to the whole Congregation. Adding „ further, that ſuch as have written againſt Indepen- „ dents do thus ſtate the difference betwixt them „ and us in this point, viz. not whether matters of „ great importance and publick concernment ought to „ be determined with the peoples free conſent (for this „ we grant) but *whether the cauſe muſt be brought to the body* „ *of the Congregation to give their voices therin together with the* „ *officers of the Church*, citing *Laget in his defence of Church-* „ *government*, *chap.* 1. and *Mr Herle* Prolocutor of the „ Aſſembly of Divines in that piece intituled *the Inde-* „ *pendency on ſcriptures of the* Independency *of Churches* page „ 3. where he ſets down this forementioned conſent to „ the Miniſter who is to be choſen, as that which we al- „ low to the members of the congregation in common. „ Adding further, that Independents place the whole eſ- „ ſence of a calling in election, accounting ordination „ to be but a ſolemnizing of it, wheras we place the „ poteſtative miſſion, not in the Churches election but „ lawfull ordination. So that in the judgement of theſe Divines the reſerving to the Presbytry the *formal au-* *thoritative miſſion* is the not the *ſole point of difference* betwixt the Independents and us, nor can a man be cleard from Independent principles in their judgement, who extends the *deciſive juridical vote in election* beyond the Elderſhip, and gives this *deciſive ſuffrage ſtrictly taken to the people* Beſides, the abſurd and dangerous conſequences following upon this opinion, allowing the *formal juridical elective ſuffrage* to the people, are evident, ſuch as 1. That this goes in ſome reſpect beyond Independents opinion as to the peoples power in elective ſuffrage, who though they give it

to

to the collective body, yet with a restriction excluding women, children and persons under age, not to every individual. 2. That this will inferr that *every point of goverment* and every cause, relating immediatly to the congregation, must be brought *to the multitude* or *body of the people*, to give their voices therin together with the officers of the Church, for upon the same ground that the elective suffrages belong to them, so must every piece of government. Now Mr Laget *ubi supra* expresly states this as the Independents principle, and as that wherin they differ from us 3. This cuts off *all right* and *power* of *a juridical eldership*, which is by our writters asserted and made good from the scriptures, and makes all their authoritative decisive suffrages, in this and other points of government, in reference to the congregation, *an invasion of the peoples right*, and unlawfull usurpation of their power; for if this formall decisive suffrage belong to all the collective body *jure divino*, how can they give it away? 4. This will by consequence bring the collective body to have their *formal decisive juridical suffrage*, *in superiour Church-judicatories*, *Presbytries*, *and synods*, in every point wherin the congregational eldership and session have an immediat interest. Again, since *consent and knowledge*, is allowed by our writters to the *whole congregation*, and *deliberation* and *counsel* to *some eminent members*, the elderships *elective suffrage*, (which in their judgement is necessarly connected with this) cannot be said to impeach the due right of the collective body of the congregation in this point; unless (as I said) we step over the march-stone, and bring in the *whole collective body* of the congregation to have *a decisive suffrage* in government. In a word, the scripture arguments, and other grounds here hinted, which do clearly conclude the people and congregations right as to *a call in general*,

*ral*, will not infer that the χειροτονια belonges *to every one of the people* or the *whole collective body*, ſo far as to import a formal deciſive ſuffrage, for it being the due right of the peoples repreſentatives, the Elderſhip (in whoſe choiſe and election the people have a great Intereſt, and to which they give a formal conſent) the congregation doth in and by them give their χειροτονια or ſuffrage, and what is *proper to ſome part* of this organick body the Church, may be well ſaid to be *the due right and action of the whole* in a general ſenſe, each part concurring *ſuo modo*. A man is ſaid to ſee, though the eye onely be *the proper organe of ſight*, becauſe the eye ſubſiſts in and with the body, and cannot act without, or ſeparated from it. So the people in a general ſenſe and *mediatly elect* by the elderſhip, the *whole collective body concurring* in what is *proper to them* herein. We heard from *Mr Gilleſpy* [*ubi ſupra*,] that among the Greeks, the people in conſenting to a choiſe of governours were ſaid χειροτονειν, ſo that although, upon the ſuppoſal of the divine right of a juridical elderſhip, repreſenting the congregation (which right is abundantly proved from ſcripture) the formal Couſiſtorial χειροτονια by juridical ſuffrage belongs to them, yet the whole collective body their χειροτονια, in the manner formerly explained, ſtands good.

His laſt anſwer is, *that if we think the peoples election ſo neceſſary that none can be a Miniſter without it, then we null the miniſtry of the whole Chriſtian world for above* 1000 *years upward, and the Miniſtry of this Church ever till the year* 1649. *For untill then patronages were not taken away. Anſ* We have proved that the People's right in the call and election of Paſtours is the pure Scripture pattern continued in the Church of God for diverſe ages, which is enough to prove that as it ought to be endeavoured after and eſtabliſhed, by Churches who would imitat this pattern of the Lords tabernacle ſhewed upon the mount:

Sei

So where it is obtained it ought to be held faſt againſt any contraire innovations. That the people's intereſt in the election and call of Miniſters and teachers had place from the Apoſtles even unto his own time in a good meaſure, may be proven (beſides what we have ſaid already to clear this) by a very unſuſpect witneſs *Marcus Antonius de dominis de Repub. Eccleſ. lib. 1. cap. 22. Num.* 10. he ſaith, *in electione miniſtrorum etiam Apoſtolorum tempore & ipſorum inſtituto, plebem & totam multitudinem magnam habuiſſe partem. And lib. 3. cap. 3. Num. 12. Iam vero poſt concilium Nicenum in electionibus eundem prorſus veterem morem perpetuo Eccleſiam ad noſtra pene tempora ſervaſſe, ut a clero & populo fieret ex patribus ac rebus geſtis, & conciliis & juribus: ex Romanorum Pontificum atteſtationibus & decretis jam ſumo comprobandum.* That is, „ that after the „ Council of Nice the ſame ancient cuſtome was own'd „ to his times by the Church, as to the peoples inte„reſt in this election and call of Miniſters, he under„takes to prove from the Fathers, from hiſtory, „ and Councils and Laws, and the very decrees of „ Popes. In the Council of Paris Anno 559. There was ſuch a decree, *Quia in aliquibus civitatibus conſuetudo priſca negligitur. &c.* „ Becauſe the ancient Cu„ſtome and decrees of the Canons are neglected in „ſome cities —— they appoint the decrees of the „ Canons to be keept, and the ancient Cuſtom, *ut nullus civibus invitis ordinetur Epiſcopus, niſi quem populi & clericorum electio pleniſſima quæſierit voluntate &c.* That none be ordained a Biſhop without the will of the citizens, but ſuch onelv whom the people and Clergy ſhall chuſe with full conſent. That the people had a right to require, call and elect their Paſtour in the ancient Church, Didoclav. proves from the Example of *Eradius, Ambroſe, Flavianus, Nectarius &c.* From pag. 326. to 331. ſhewing that *Cyprian* ſaith of *Rabbinus* that he was choſen

ſen Biſhop, *de univerſæ fraternitatis ſuffragio*, lib. 1. Ep. 2. *By the choſe of the whole Brethren.* From the Epiſtle of the *Council of Nice*, to thoſe of *Alexandria, Lybia, &c.* which is extant with *Theodoret* Hiſt. lib. 1. cap. 9. Where he ſhews that thoſe who ſucceed in the room of the dead Prelat muſt upon theſe terms ſucceed, *ſi digni viderentur, & populus eligeret*, if they appear worthy and the people ſhall chuſe; That *Chryſoſtom* ſucceeded to *Nectarius*; *poſtquam in hoc Clerus & populus ſuffragia ſua contuliſſent*, *after he was called and choſen by the Clergy and people. Sozom. lib. 3. c. 8.* That *Evagrius* was choſen *ſuffragiis*, *or by votes and ſuffrages*, *Socrates lib. 6 cap. 13.* That *Auguſtine* called again and again for the people's conſent as to his ſucceſſour, *Hic mihi veſtra aſſentatione opus eſt.* Ep. 11. To which may be added, a very impartial witneſs Biſhop Bilſon (*Perpetual Government Chap. 15. page 434.*) Where he ſhewes that the people had their right in chuſing their Paſtours. Onely, to prevent miſtake upon theſe paſſages, we would take notice, that this *ſuffrage* here atribute *generally* and *indiſcriminatim*, to the people and clergy, muſt be underſtood *pro uniuſcujuſque modulo* and *according to every ones capacity*, for the reaſons above rendred. Since both Miniſters right in ordination, and alſo the right of a juridicall elderſhip in churches conſtitute in reference to the election of Miniſters, hath (as we have ſhown) a clear foundation in Scripture and antiquity. But of this enough. 2. We have alſo proven that we are not concerned, nor in the leaſt conſtrained by our principles and practice in this caſe, *to null a Church or Miniſtry where this call is wanting*, it being enough for us, that the want of it is *a corruption* rendring a Miniſtry not ſo pure as it ought to be, and that our caſe being a caſe of competition betwixt Miniſters holding faſt this piece of our Covenanted Reformation, and a party of Schiſmatick

tick Innovators oppoſing and rejecting it, and turning back to the vomit of this and other corruptions, after they have been ſeen, caſt out, and vowed againſt: We are upon the grounds of our Reformation and vows, ſufficiently warranted to leave theſe innovators, and adhere to the faithfull Miniſtry. 3. As we did ſhew that the granting of Curats their having *the eſſence of a miniſterial call*, will not infer our *hearing and owning them in every caſe*, and eſpecially *in ours* (which himſelf muſt grant, unleſs he fall in a palpable contradiction) ſo its more then he can prove, that this Church of Scotland from its firſt beginning, till 1649 had patronages; Which being founded on the Common law, and ſeveral ages poſterior to the pure Church in this Nation, planted (as we heard) without Prelats by ſome of Johns Diſciples, how abſurd is it to aſſert that it had *Patronages from the beginning*. Finally, whatever tollerance of theſe corruptions before they be removed may be pleaded for, yet ſuch as have embraced them now, yea & as a badge of owning this deformation of our once glorious Church, are certainly to be diſowned by all who would hold faſt their integrity. For what he adds, *anent our owning Presbyterian Miniſters adhering to our Reformation, tho they have been preſented by Patrons*, It's both impertinent to the point and already anſwered, For its not this *ſimpliciter, or only*, which we ground upon in this practice, as is often ſaid, but the principles, ſtate, practice, and deſign, of Conformiſts *in this complex caſe* Beſide, who ſees not the difference betwixt a Miniſter owning the principles of our Reformation, and diſowning this with other corruptions, although the times neceſſity did conſtrain to make uſe of patronages in their firſt entry, when our Church was as yet groaning under this bondage, and ſuch as owne this corruption both in judgment and practice after

after it is rejected, and the Church delivered from it, yea and owne it as an expreſs badge of Conformity to abjured Prelacy. Sure they are very blind who ſee not the difference betwixt theſe.

The Doubter alleadges [that patronages are abjured in the Covenant] and the *Informer deſires to ſee in in what place.* But if he will open his eyes and but read either our National or ſolemn league, he will eaſily ſee this; for patronages being *a popiſh corruption contrary to the Word of God* (as we have proved) it's abjured among the *rites or Cuſtoms brought into this Church; without or againſt the word*; And likewiſe in being condemned in *the 2. book of diſcipline*, to which we vow adherence as unto *the diſcipline* of this Church, it muſt be in that reſpect alſo abjured; And as *contrary to ſound doctrine, the power of godlineſs, and Government of this Church* expreſt in the 2. book of Diſcipline, it is abjured in the ſolemn League, wherein we likewiſe vow *adherence to that diſcipline.* But (ſaith he) *Since patronages were in uſe after the Covenant, why was not this breach diſcerned, and was this Church perjured all that time. Anſ.* The forecited act of Parliament ſhewes that this corruption had been long by this Church groan'd under, and long before that time declared and teſtified againſt, both in the 2. book of diſcipline, and by aſſemblies thereafter, and if (the interpoſing of the civill Magiſtrat being neceſſary to remove this) the Church ſtill untill that time groan'd under this burden, where can he fixe his challenge?

The next argument of his Doubter for not hearing Curats, is [that they are ordained by Biſhops.] To which he anſwers 1. *That all whom we refuſe to hear, were not ordained by Biſhops.* He means thoſe who were ordained by the Presbytery, and have conformed, *Anſ.* 1. We have already told him that it is not the Epiſcopal ordination *ſimply and abſtractedly from our caſe,*

which is our ground of not owning them, but the Episcopal ordination of *perjured intruders breaking our union and reformation, and ejecting our faithfull Pastours, and testified against by our presbyterian protestant Church which they have thus intruded upon.* 2. We have told him that the concession of their *lawfull ordination for substance*, will no more plead for our owning them in this complex case, then their concession of *the lawfull ordination of Presbyterian ministers*, will infer *an obligation upon Conformists to owne them*, which is a consequence that they all deny. And that they must grant, that owning of *the episcopal ordination in this complex case*, is different from a *simple owning of it*, in relation to hearing. Even as Presbyterian ministers are acknowledged by conformists to have a *lawfull ordination for substance*, whom notwithstanding they will not *suffer the people to hear*. 3. Those who were so ordained and have conformed, having (as I said) *eatenus* or in so far, renounc'd their Presbyterial ordination, and adhering to the prelatical as the more perfect, this their disowning of our reformation (especially aggreged by their perjury and apostacy) puts them in the same, yea a worse condition as to our hearing them, then those that are meerly ordained by the prelats. 3. He tells us, „That on this „ground we would not adhere to these whom Timo„thy and Titus ordained, nor would we have heard „a minister for many ages of the Church; Then he „tells us of Jeroms, *qu'd facit excepta ordinatione Epis„copus*, and that ministers have now a hand in ordai„ning Conformists. That on this ground we would „not have heard the members of the Assembly 1638. „who were thus ordained, and some now though „non-conformists, who were ordained before the „year 1638 by Bishops, the validity of which ordina„tion is vindicat by *Ius divinum minist. Angl.* *Ans.* We have already proven, that Episcopal ordination

is not

is not in the leſt warranted by the Authority of Timothy and Titus ſuppoſed in theſe Epiſtles, but rather a Presbyterial ordination, which is the pattern ſhewed upon the mount. 2. We have alſo proven that his prelatick ordination, whereof the Prelat hath he ſole and proper power according to this conſtitution, is a ſtranger, in the firſt purer ages, and even in Jerom's time. 3. We have alſo proven that the granting of the eſſentialls of their miniſterial call who are ordained by Biſhops, will plead nothing for owning Curats, who are both ſcandalous and perjured intruders and have nothing for the moſt part which may in the leaſt ground a charitable conſtruction that they were ever called of God; and are ſtanding in oppoſition to a faithful miniſtry, by them excluded and perſecute from their watchowers, none of which can be ſaid of the inſtances which he mentions. As for that concurrence which he pretends Conformiſts have with the Biſhops in ordination of miniſters, it is according to our Law, *meerly precarious and pro forma.* And therefore utterly inſufficient to found his concluſion.

The Doubter objects, [ that tho ſome of them were ordained by the Presbytery, yet they are now turn'd the Biſhops Curats.] He might have added, and turned *court or Eraſtian-Curats*, ſince the *all* of our preſent Conformiſts authority, is derived from *the court* and ſubordinat to the *ſupremacy*, as is evident in the act of reſtitution and other ſubſequents acts. In anſwer to this he alleadges *weakneß of judgement, ſtrength of paſſion* in the objecter, but really ſhews both in himſelf, by telling us, *that we may fear Chriſts threatning, he that deſpiſes you deſpiſes me*, ſince he hath not yet made, it appear that the men he pleads for have a *relaion to this Church as her true Paſtours*, according to the principles and tenor

of our Reformation. Then he tells us, *that Curat ſignifies a cure of ſouls.* But the *True Non-conformiſt*, told his fellow Dialogiſt, that „ *this term* owes its invention to mens vanity, loathing the lowly Scripture ſtyle of „ Miniſter, and is in effect nothing but the iſſue of the „ corrution of the Churches humility, and that what „ they pretend herein while deſtroying in ſtead of fee l- „ ing, is like to ſtand in Judgement againſt them at „ the great day. For his next interpretation of [Curat] viz. *he that ſerves the cure tho not the Miniſter of the place, but the ſubſtitute of another*, We owe him thanks, for one egg is not liker another, then they are to ſuch vicarious ſubſtitutes. But he will not have them called *the Biſhops Curats, as if he were Paſtour of the dioceſs, and they deputed, under him, and Biſhop* (he ſaith) *hath ſuch thoughts of miniſters.* What their *thoughts* are, is beſt ſeen by *their deeds.* We have proved that according to this frame of prelacy the Biſhop is properly the ſole Paſtour of the Dioceſs. In the 7. Argument againſt Prelacy.

The Doubters next objection is, [that they are perjured perſons, and therefore not to be heard.] He anſwers 1. *That many of them never took the Covenant, and therefore are not perjured*, which is already removed, when we did prove from Deut. 29. that it oblidges even thoſe who did not perſonally ſwear. Its remarkable that Deut. 5. 2, 3. God is ſaid to have made a Covenant with his people in Horeb, even with us (ſaith Moſes) and all of us alive here this day. They were dead who engadged at Horeb, and many there preſent were not then born. So Neh. 9. 38. all entered into Covenant, but ſome only did ſeal it. Sure the *intention, and relation* of the Covenanters, and the *matter of the Oath it ſelf*, will make it thus extenſive. Next he ſayes, *Miniſters that took it, and comply with prelacy are not perjured, for the reaſons which he gave in the laſt*

*com-*

*conference.* Which reasons I have there answered, and proved that there is nothing in our case, which may in the least limit or invalidat its obligation, and upon the grounds which are offered to evince the standing obligation of that Oath, I do affirme that they are perjured. 3. He tells us, *That scandalous faults tho deserving censure, yet while it is not inflicted, and the person not convict, his Ministry ought to be waited upon, as Judas who came cloathed with Christs commission to preach, so long as he was not convict, yet was to be heard. Ans.* 1. He grants *that scandalous faults, specially of an high nature, and if the man be impenitent, do deserve deposition.* Now their faults are both scandalous and of a high nature, such as prophanity, perjury and apostacy, in all which they are most impenitent and avow the same; and as for their being convict and censured, which he requireth as needfull for disowning them, I answer they stand upon the matter convict by clear scripture grounds, and by the standing acts and Iudicial decision of this Church in her supreme judicatories and assemblies, which have condemned and made censurable with deposition their present principles and practices, in opposition to her vows and government. Again, there is a great difference betwixt what ought to be people's carriage toward scandalous Ministers when a redress by Lawfull Church Judicatories may be had, to which people may have recourse, and what the duty of a people is in that case, wherin a prevailing backsliding party, and a persecuting Magistrat owne such Ministers; so that the true Church can have no access for censuring and removing them. In this last case supposing their scandals to be of a high nature, this inevitable necessity of the Churches incapacity for present, may supply the defect of a formal censure (in the judgment of some) and ground a disowning of them, as if they were already cast out,

of our Reformation. Then he tells us, *that Curat ſignifies a cure of ſouls.* But the *True Non-conformiſt*, told his fellow Dialogiſt, that „ *this term* owes its invention to mens vanity, loathing the lowly Scripture ſtyle of „ Miniſter, and is in effect nothing but the iſſue of the „ corrution of the Churches humility, and that what „ they pretend herein while deſtroying in ſtead of feed-„ ing, is like to ſtand in Judgement againſt them at „ the great day. For his next interpretation of [Curat] viz. *he that ſerves the cure tho not the Miniſter of the place, but the ſubſtitute of another*, We owe him thanks, for one egg is not liker another, then they are to ſuch vicarious ſubſtitutes. But he will not have them called *the Biſhops Curats, as if he were Paſtour of the dioceſs, and they deputed, under him, and Biſhop* (he ſaith) *hath ſuch thoughts of miniſters.* What their *thoughts* are, is beſt ſeen by *their deeds.* We have proved that according to this frame of prelacy the Biſhop is properly the ſole Paſtour of the Dioceſs. In the 7, Argument againſt Prelacy.

The Doubters next objection is, [that they are perjured perſons, and therefore not to be heard.] He anſwers 1. *That many of them never took the Covenant, and therefore are not perjured*, which is already removed, when we did prove from Deut. 29. that it oblidges even thoſe who did not perſonally ſwear. Its remarkable that Deut. 5. 2, 3. God is ſaid to have made a Covenant with his people in Horeb, even with us (ſaith Moſes) and all of us alive here this day. They were dead who engadged at Horeb, and many there preſent were not then born. So Neh. 9. 38. all entered into Covenant, but ſome only did ſeal it. Sure the *intention, and relation* of the Covenanters, and the *matter of the Oath it ſelf*, will make it thus extenſive. Next he ſayes, *Miniſters that took it, and comply with prelacy are not perjured, for the reaſons which he gave in the laſt*

*con-*

*conference.* Which reaſons I have there anſwered, and proved that there is nothing in our caſe, which may in the leaſt limit or invalidat its obligation, and upon the grounds which are offered to evince the ſtanding obligation of that Oath, I do affirme that they are perjured. 3. He tells us, *That ſcandalous faults tho deſerving cenſure, yet while it is not inflicted, and the perſon not convict, his Miniſtry ought to be waited upon, as Judas who came cloathed with Chriſts commiſſion to preach, ſo long as he was not convict, yet was to be heard. Ans.* 1. He grants *that ſcandalous faults, ſpecially of an high nature, and if the man be impenitent, do deſerve depoſition.* Now their faults are both ſcandalous and of a high nature, ſuch as prophanity, perjury and apoſtacy, in all which they are moſt impenitent and avow the ſame; and as for their being convict and cenſured, which he requireth as needfull for diſowning them, I anſwer they ſtand upon the matter convict by clear ſcripture grounds, and by the ſtanding acts and Iudicial deciſion of this Church in her ſupreme judicatories and aſſemblies, which have condemned and made cenſurable with depoſition their preſent principles and practices, in oppoſition to her vows and government. Again, there is a great difference betwixt what ought to be people's carriage toward ſcandalous Miniſters when a redreſs by Lawfull Church Judicatories may be had, to which people may have recourſe, and what the duty of a people is in that caſe, wherin a prevailing backſliding party, and a perſecuting *Magiſtrat* owne ſuch Miniſters; ſo that the true Church can have no acceſs for cenſuring and removing them. In this laſt caſe ſuppoſing their ſcandals to be of a high nature, this inevitable neceſſity of the Churches incapacity for preſent, may ſupply the defect of a formal cenſure (in the judgment of ſome) and ground a diſowning of them, as if they were already caſt out,

eſpecially if their entry be by perjurious intruſion, and their profanity and ſcandals therafter notour to all. Now how applicable this is to Conformiſts, needs not my paines to ſubſume. We might alſo here tell him that there are ſcandals which are *officiall*, rendring the man *coram Deo* no officer, and that in caſe of their becoming very atrocius Mr Durham will allow to depart to more pure ordinances. *On ſcandal page* 129. Although we will not take upon us to determine, how & in what caſes, during the Churches incapacity, & diſcompoſed ſtate, a Miniſters atrocious ſcandals after his entry, and perjurious uſurpation in the way and manner therof, may ſupply the want of a formal cenſure, yet abſolutly to deny that in any imaginable caſe, whether of the ſcandals and intruſion of the miniſter, the Churches incapacity to cenſure, or the peoples clamant neceſſity, and apparent advantages for their edification otherwiſe they were oblidged to own him ſtill, and that nothing but this declarative ſentence, could looſe their tye, would, infer very dangerous conſequences obvious to the meaneſt reflection. Specialy that in performance of ſuppoſed duties, flowing from the tye and relation, they would croſſe many ſcriptur-precepts enjoyning the contrary. Shall Chriſts ſheep follow the hireling and ſtranger, and not beware of wolves and falſe prophets, ſtrengthen Covenant breakers, and ſciſmaticks, becauſe a perturbed Church cannot draw forth her cenſure. If it be ſaid that this will open a door for ſeparation, ſince every one diſpleaſed, may pretend that ſcandals are of an highnature. *Ans.* 1. The ſinful abuſive pretences of men, is a poor argument to infringe any truth or duty. 2. This abſurdity may be retorted in the other extreme, and under pretence of the mans exterior call who is not (nor can be in a Churches diſturbed ſtate) cenſured, Chriſts ſheep may (as I ſaid) be given up to deſtroying wolves, the means and op

por-

portunities of their edification loſt, and their ſoules expoſed to moſt imminent hazard of periſhing. 2. There is a pure Miniſtry and Church free of their ſcandalls, and teſtifying againſt them, ſo that adherence to them rather then Curats is only a *non-union to corruption*, or a ſcandalous party of Innovators who have gone out from the fellowſhip of this Church, and ſuch a *ſeparation negative or non-union*, as Mr Rutherfoord allowes, *Due right of Presbyt. pag.* 253, 254. ſuch as he ſayes was „ the carriage of the faithfull in relation to „ the Donatiſts in Auguſtines time, or a ſeparation „ from the *moſt and worſt part* not the *leaſt and beſt part*, „ as he there diſtinguiſhes, calling the greateſt cor- „ rupt part the Schiſmaticks; As before the Jewes „ came to blaſpheme, there was no reaſon to joyn to „ them rather then the Goſpel Church, planted by „ the Apoſtles, to which Mr Rutherfoord ſayes, „ converts were to adhere. 3. We have heard that according to our principles and the tenor of our Reformation, we are to look upon them as *Schiſmaticks from this Church.* So that upon this very ground of *holding and mantaining this Churches purity and union*, they are to be diſowned by Gods people. Our *Informer* will grant that abſtracting from a Miniſters being otherwiſe either cenſured or cenſurable, he ought not to be followed in a Schiſmatick courſe to the ruine of a pure Churches union, but is *ipſo facto* to be left: for upon this *ground* he pleads for *diſowning Presbyterian Miniſters* abſtracting from their being any *otherwayes cenſured.* 4. Are there not many Presbyterian miniſters *neither convict nor cenſured*, and whom he dare not call *ſcandalous*, whoſe converſation and walk is both convincing and ſhining, and ſuch as diſcovers that Chriſt is in them, that they have the maſters ſeal and call to preach the Goſpel; who have entered into this Church by the door, and are ſtanding in a miniſtrial *relation*

to her, yet he pleads for disowning them, meerly because their Ministry is cross to the *prelatick union and order*. So he must grant that Ministers may be disowned on this ground of Innovating upon, and standing in opposition to *a Churches established union and order*, abstracting from this formal censure. As for what he adds of Judas, its very impertinently alledged here, for his theft and other wickedness was as yet *secret*, and not become *open* and *scandalous*, which excepts him from the compass of this question, which is anent Ministers guilty of *open and avowed scandalls*, intrusion into the Ministry, violent ejection of faithfull pastours, and persecution of a pure Church. None of which can be said of Judas.

But now followes in the next place, his main objection and argument from the Scribes and Pharisees, he tells us, *what great exceptions might have been made against their life and doctrine, Math. 23. that they were enemies to Christ, neglected Judgement, mercy and faith: that they were proud hypocrites, and that tho all which Naphtali sayes of Conformists were true* (and all sees it to be true and consequently that he gives them no other characters then what they put upon themselves, and cannot more be charged *with distemper* for this, then our blessed Lord in calling these Pharisees, serpents and vipers, or Paul in calling the Impostours of whom the Philippians were in hazard, dogs, evil workers, the concision, whose God is their belly, whose glory is in their shame *though they were* (*as these pharisees*) *gross in their lives, and there were leaven in their doctrine, they were not to be disowned, since altho the Pharisees for doctrine taught the commands of men; and took away the key of knowledge, Christ in his sermon on the mount purged the Law from their corrupt glosses, yet Simeon and Anna turned not separatists, Joseph and Mary went up to keep the passover, and Christ bids hear them, tho with a caveat to beware of their*

*leaven, and their ill example.* Here he alſo tells us, *that he hath no pleaſure to make a parallel betwixt the Phariſees and our preachers in long prayers, and devouring widowes houſes, compaſſing ſea and land to make proſelytes, tho we have given too much ground for theſe compariſons. Anſ.* 1. To beginne with this laſt invective (which he inſinuats, and Dr Burnet proſecutes at large in his trifling dialogues) If I ſhould rejoyn that its a foming out their own ſhame, to make ſuch compariſons, and renders them too like theſe wandring ſtars to whom this is attributed, It were no great overſtreach. Dare he ſay that our Lord did *ſimply condemn long prayers*, becauſe he condemned *making a ſhew of them*; or that faithfull miniſters their travells to keep poor ſouls upon the ſolid foundation of our ſworn Reformation, and recover them from this prelatick corruption and apoſtacy, is to proſelyte them to be *children of hell*? It may be with better ground averred that prelatiſts who are enemies to either long or ſhort prayers in the ſpirit, and plead for dead formes and lyturgies, and who have devoured not *widowes houſes only*, but *Gods houſe and Church in this land*, and who compaſs ſea and land to proſelyte this poor Church to the *Synagogue of Rome*, are much liker theſe precedents in the abovementioned characters.

But 2. To his argument, *The phariſees were ſcandalous in their life, corrupt in their doctrine, yet the ſaints ſeparat not from ordinances, and Chriſt allowed to hear them.* This man might (if he had been ingenuous) have found this objection ſolidly anſwered and removed by ſeverals. I anſwer 1. Its more then he hath proved, that the owning of the Phariſees miniſtry is here enjoyned, becauſe 1. The command of *obſerving what they enjoyned*, will not neceſſarly infer this; we may obſerve what morall Philoſophers, or papiſts bid us do under ſuch like reſtrictions and limitations, upon

which people are enjoyned to obſerve what the Phariſees preſcribed; we may obſerve what civil Rulers bid us do, but not own them as teachers. 2. There are many things in the context, which ſeem utterly to repugn to this inference that our Lord enjoyned the owning or attending of their inſtructions as eccleſiaſtick teachers. 1. He bids beware of *their leaven or doctrine* Math. 16.12. joyning them with Sadducees who denyed the reſurrection, and erred fundamentally, ſure not to hear them was the beſt way to evite their leaven, 2. It will be hard to prove that they were *Prieſt Phariſees*, ſince all the Phariſees were not ſuch, as *Nicodemus and Joſeph of Arimathea*, who were civil Rulers, and conſequently any command to *obey them*, will no more infer *hearing them preach*, then ſuch a command as to council or parliament. The thing commanded is not *hearing them as teachers*, but only *obedience* which may be very properly enjoyned as to civil Rulers. 3. The *qualities aſcribed unto them*, ſuch as their ſitting in *Moſes chair*, who was King in Jeſurun, not *Aarons* who was the Pieſt, their loving the chief ſeats in ſynagogues, (whereas, if teachers, their chief ſeat was knowen, and appropriat to them) their paying tithes (whereas, if prieſts tithes were payable to them) theſe qualities (I ſay) ſeem to import that they were not *prieſts and teachers by office*, that hearing of them, or attending their miniſtry as ſuch, is enjoyned *hearing of* and atteding their Miniſtry as ſuch. 15.4. Chriſt bids *let them alone*, which ſounds like, *owne them not as teachers*. He calls them *blind leaders of the blind*, nay he calls them *the ſtranger whoſe voice the true ſheep hear not*, but rather the true ſhepherd Math. 15.13,14, Joh. 10.4,5. and ſuch as ſhut up heaven againſt men, and hindred ſuch as were entring; all which ſeem very inconſiſtent with a command of *hearing them*. 5 Chriſt ſpoke to the diſciples as well as the people in this precept. Now its certain

that

that neither the disciples did ever hear them, nor could they leave his Ministry, nor is it found that Christ who came to fulfill all righteousness, taught them to do so, by his example. Finally the words of this precept have for their scope to engadge to beware of the Pharisees infectious evills: so that this command to do & observe what they delivered as sitting in Moses seat, which they did then possess, is but by way of concession, which supposes only that which he intended shortly to abolish, and now would have improven for the best advantadge.

2. Granting that they were to be heard, I deny his consequence, that therfore Curats in this our case are to be heard also; the cases are very different, and the disparity when cleared will discover his consequence to be naught, *from the hearing of the Pharisees, to the hearing of Conformists.* I offer it then in these particulars. 1. These Pharisees Ministry was not *of it self actually exclusive of, and a direct intrusion upon* the Ministry of faithfull teachers. Suppose they had chased away all Israels Lawfull teachers, and by perjurious violence thrust themselves into their rooms, would our Lord have bidden own or hear them? If our *Informer* say so he will contradict himself, and overturn the scope of his reasoning in this dialogue, for he thniks that the ministry of Presbyterian ministers, *is intrusion*, and therupon pleads *for disowning and not hearing them.* 2. He pleads for owning Curats *as Christs ambassadours cloathed with his authority to deliver his message,* but Christ doth here (at least for any thing he hath said from this text) only enjoyn to hear *the Pharisees interpretation and decision of that nations Municipal or civil Law,* anent the rules of external righteousness and civil policy, which two are very different. 3. Christ having guarded the Law from their corrupt glosses, and the disciples from their snares, shewes in this precept

how

how to make the beſt advantage of that diſpenſation; now ready to vaniſh away, ſince he was ſhortly to erect a goſpel miniſtry, and remove all that legal diſpenſation, and then none of them were to be heard: But this man pleads for diſowning our faithfull ſent goſpel miniſters under a ſtanding relation to this Church, and the obligation of Chriſts ſtanding command, and commiſſion to officiat, and this in favours of intruding hirelings uſurping their places, and oppoſing theſe faithfull Ambaſſadours in their maſters work and meſſage. Now who ſees not the difference betwixt theſe. 4. They were not in a ſtated oppoſition to a faithfull body of teachers, acknowledged and owned by the ſound Church of Iſrael and teſtifying againſt them, ſeeking to root them out, and together with them a reformation, to which all had recently vowed adherence. 5. There was *no badge or Teſt of complyance with all their abominations* particularly appointed and enjoyned by the Rulers, in this *act of hearing* them, as there is in our caſe in relation to the hearing of Curats, rendring (as I ſaid) the not hearing them, and adherence rather to a faithfull Miniſtry teſtifying againſt them, *a caſe of confeſſion*, eſpecially this difference will be apparent, if our National vows and Covenant, expreſly obliging *to adhere to theſe faithfull miniſters*, in oppoſition to them and their courſe of backſliding, be duely pondered.

Next, as for what he ſayes of Simeon and Anna; Joſeph and Mary, their attending the temple Worſhip at that time; as his argument there from is removed by what is ſaid, ſo to clear this further, I add 1. That its wide reaſoning from the godly their lawful concurrence with that Church (now under the ruſt of old corruptions) in what was good and ſound, to our deſerting a ſound Church and miniſtry to comply with

with *abjured corruptions, and Schismatick innovators*, reintroduced after they have been cast out. 2. Its as wide reasoning, from their *not separating* from Gods ancient Church upon the ground of corruptions, to conclude against *non-complyance with a party who are not our Church* (tho they usurp her name) but are opposed and testifyed against, by our true Church and ministry. We in this case (as I have said) do not separat from the *Church of Scotland*, *her Doctrine, Worship, or ministry*, but only from *Schismatick backsliders from the union & reformation of this Church*. But in the case of these old saints & worthies, separation from the temple, would have imported an absolute separation from *the ministry & Church of Israel*. In a word, the utter impertinency of all his pleading in this argument, and from these instances, appears in this, that he supposes that its meerly for Conformists *personal faults* we disowne ordinances administred by them, as if they were ther by polluted; which has no more truth in it, then that its meerly for Presbyterian ministers *personal faults* as pulluting the worship, that he pleads for disowning them, but upon the grounds of the present case and circumstances, wherein they stand, he pleads for disowning Presbyterian ministers, and they more justly because of Conformists present case, plead for disowning them, as is said and cleard above.

After this he cites Mr Durham on Revel. 3. *inferring from what is said of the Angel of Sardis and Laodicea, that a minister as to his case unsound, may be owned and esteem'd as such*. But how impertinent this is to our purpose any may see, for their scandalous carriage in their walk is much more then unsoundness as to their case, which notwithstanding we acknowledge will not of it self, and *primo instanti* warrand separation from ordinances in every case. But we have cleared that we have much more to lay to the charge of Conformists,

formists, then either *inward unsoundness*, *or outward scandalls* simply considered; even their corrupt Doctrine, their intrusion, their stated opposition to this Church her principles, union, and Reformation. As to what Mr Durham adds, and our *Informer* cites in relation to „ the ordinances their not suffering „ derogation in whatsoever hands they be anent a due „ ministerial respect to the Pharisees tho their rottenness was discovered by our Lord: that Judas was „ to be received as an Ambassadour with other Apo„ stles —— that God makes usefull Instruments „ sometimes —— and that edification doth not ne„ cessarly depend upon the holiness of the Instrument, Act. 3. 12. Matth. 7. 23. Its utterly remote from our purpose, as is clear from what is said, for neither can he prove that this practice is a *separation properly such*, nor doth that case of *an Improvement of the pharisees teaching during that time of the legall dispensation, now shortly to be abolisht*, meet our purpose, nor the case of Judas *hid abominations*, correspond with that of *avowed perjury and apostacy from the vows and Reformation of our Church.* Nor is there here a supposed *prior obligation of adherence to conformists ministry*, preponderating any objection *as to their scandalls.* What can this man say, if we shall plead these reasons of Mr Durham, for adhering to Presbyterian ministers, viz. „ *that ordinances ought not to* „ *be despised in whatever hands they be, that even the pharisees* „ *and Judas himself might be heard*, and therefore much „ more Presbyterian ministers of this Church, that God „ can make even graceless men Instruments of good; „ that the efficacy of means depends not on the holy„ ness of the instrument. Now will he admit a conclusion of *owning Presbyterian Ministers* from these principles; nay, he thinks that maters stand so with them because of their supposed *Schism and disorder*, that for as applicable as these things are to them, yet they

ought

ought not to be heard. And ſo by *his own confeſſion and pleading* this will conclude nothing for him, untill his above mentioned *groundleſs ſuppoſitions* be made good. Now let me retort of our *Informers* angry Querie here, how can they Juſtifie withdrawing people from Presbyterian Miniſters, ſince not ſo bad as the ſcribes and Phariſees, if they have *either knowledge or moderation*. He muſt then of neceſſity grant, if he will not contradict himſelf, that all theſe grounds will not plead for hearing in ſome caſes, & that the London Miniſters aſſertion anent *the validity of the Epiſcopal ordination for ſubſtance* (repeated here again *ad nauſeam*) falls utterly ſhort of proving his concluſion. Thoſe Miniſters do aſſert, that the Presbyterian ordination *is the more pure and conform to the ſcripture pattern*, what will he then ſay to this concluſion, that upon this ground (and eſpecially becauſe Conformiſts themſelves owne the validity of Presbyterian Miniſters ordination) *they are inconſequent to themſelves, as well as going croſs to ſcripture and ſound reaſon, in diſowning the miniſtry of the Presbyterian miniſters of this Church, and withdrawing people from hearing them.* Let him pull out this beam from his own eye, and his anſwer ſhall eaſily ſerve for us.

The Doubter alledges, that in Math. 23. [We are not bidden hear the ſcribes and Phariſees, and that the words will not bear that.] He anſwers *that he forbids not to hear as we forbid to hear Conformiſts.* *Ans.* 1. We have ſeen that there is more may be alledged from the Scripture as to a prohibition to be their ordinary and conſtant hearers at leaſt, (which he pleads for as to Conformiſts) then he can alledge as to a command of hearing. 2. That the tollerance or allowance of a hearing of them during that ſhortly to be aboliſht legall diſpenſation, is far from coming up to his concluſion of owning curats in this our caſe. 3. He anſwers

wers, *that Mr Durham ſpeaks of a miniſterial reſpect due to theſe Phariſees, and that without hearing, this miniſterial reſpect is Lame. Ans.* Mr Durhams reaſon anent a Miniſterial reſpect is in relation to the Improvement of their teaching, & tho granted in the greateſt latitude he can imagine, will not inferr his concluſion of owning Curats in this caſe as is already cleared. Admitting that a *due Miniſterial reſpect*, will infer *hearing* in Mr Durhams ſenſe and inſtance, yet in our caſe, (which I told him Mr Durhams aſſertion will not ſpeak unto) acknowledgment of a man to be a Miniſter, and capable of *a Miniſterial reſpect in ſo far*, will not bear this concluſion, elſe the *Informer* hath in a clap devoured and eaten in again all this Dialogue in pleading againſt this Miniſterial reſpect in hearing Presbyterian Miniſters, whoſe Miniſterial authority he acknowledges. 2ly, He anſwers, *that our Lord enjoyns obedience to that which they bid do, and that as ſitting in Moſes chair ——— and how could that be except the people heard them teach from Moſes chair ——— he that bids obey a Miniſters injunctions from the word of God, conſequently bids hear him deliver his doctrine from the word. Ans.* We told him that for any thing that he, or any of his fellow pleaders, have yet offered from this text, theſe Phariſees might be *civil national doctors and interpreters of Moſes Judiciall Law, and of Iſraels municipal Law*, from his civil chair, who was *King in Jeſurun*, which will no more infer a hearing them *teach and preach as Church officers*, then our obedience to the *King, Councel, parliament and Seſſion*, will infer that concluſion. 2. His parallels as to *the command of obeying a Miniſters doctrine from the word* its inferring *an injunction of hearing him deliver theſe doctrines from the word*, is (in this caſe and queſtion) pityfull ſophiſtry and begging of the queſtion, in ſuppoſing that theſe anent whom this injunction was given, were *Eccleſiaſtick Miniſters*, which he hath

hath not yet proved. 2. That *teaching from Moſes chair*, is in this caſe equivalent to *Miniſterial goſpel teaching and preaching from the word of God*, which he has not proved either, ſince (as I ſaid) Gods word contained the Jews municipal Law, which civil Judges might in that capacity deliver and interpret, in relation to external righteouſneſs betwixt man and man in things of this life. Finally, granting they were to be heard teach and expone, which he hath not yet made good from the text, it will nothing help his cauſe for the reaſons often given: ſo that the *ſeparation* which he improves this place againſt, being his *groundleſs ſuppoſition* alledged but not proven by him, and by us diſproved by what is ſaid above, and likewiſe the application *of this hearing the Phariſees* to our *hearing Curats*, being his bare *petitio principii*, his aſſertion after ſubjoyned viz. *that this paſſage will ſtand againſt us to our conviction as againſt the ſeperatiſts in Queen Elizabeths time;* is but a piece of his ignorant arrogant confidence; there being a vaſt difference betwixt our caſe, and that of thoſe ſeparatiſts at that time, as ſhall hereafter appear. And beſide, Presbyterian Miniſters of this Church have much more to ſay from this text, for their people's adhering to them, then prelatiſts can plead.

The Doubter next alleadges, [that many Epiſcopall men have entered upon honeſt mens Labours, and therefore ought to be diſowned as intruders.] He anſwers 1. *That all are not ſuch, that ſome Conformiſts have kept their places they had before the change, others have entered in to the labours of thoſe that are dead and tranſported elſwhere. Ans.* Our *Informer* doth miſerably pinch and narrow *a ſinfull intruſion* by this deſcription; which himſelf muſt acknowledge. For ſhould a Presbyterian Miniſter ſtep into his own Church upon the death or tranſportation of one of the Curats, who

will queſtion that this man will call it an intruſion according to his principles anent the prelatick Church, and ſo he muſt acknowledge that notwithſtanding what he here pleads, the Curats entry is intruſion according to our principles; beſide that the Miniſtery of thoſe who have conformed, and were Presbyterially ordained, being an *expreſs owning of the principles, practices and deſign, of this prelatick ſchiſmatick deſtroying party*, and by their acceptance of collation and preſentation, and concurring in the Prelats pretended Judicatories, *a miniſtry compleatly of the prelatick mould*, its *reductive*, if not *formaliter*, an intruſion; or partaking with the general intruſion and uſurpation upon the pure reformed Miniſtry and Church of Scotland, even as a ſtate officer or Magiſtrat his taking his office from *Invaders*, while an army is in the fields againſt them, doth fully and fitly denominate him an *Invader* in the exerciſe thereof, tho it be *materially* the ſame office and imployment which he had before. Or as an inferior officer in an army taking his *office and a new commiſſion* from an *uſurping General*, and other uſurping ſuperior officers, who are diſſolving and betraying *the true army*, expelling the *true General* and officers contrary to their firſt commiſſion, doth partake in that uſurpation. Conſidering the Church of Scotland as it ſtood eſtabliſht in doctrine, diſcipline, worſhip, and government, and her National and ſolemn vows, ſurely this courſe of Conformity is a moſt *groſs intruſion upon her*, without ſo much as a ſhadow of conſent; and ſo is all partaking therein by conſequence, which no Conformiſt can acquit himſelf of; and therefore according to the tenor and principles of our Reformation, cannot be lookt upon as any of our true Church her Sons and Miniſters.

But here our *Informer* poſeth us with ſome great *queries* forſooth 1. *Whether Conformiſts were active in ur-*

*ing*

*ting Presbyterian miniſters, or came in before they were out, and their places declared vacant. Ans.* Whoever is active or paſſive in outting them, one thing is ſure, they are violently thruſt out contrary to the word of God, and the rules, order, and Reformation of this Church. So that come in who will, they are Intruders. 1. Becauſe they have come in upon a charge to which faithfull Miniſters of this Church have Chriſts Keyes and commiſſion. 2. Becauſe come in and obtruded by thoſe who are ingrained *uſurpers, thieves and Robbers*; I mean perfidious Prelats (often abjured and caſt out of this Church with deteſtation) and not in the order of this Church, Nor by her door. A poor man is by a number of Robbers *diſpoſſeſt of his houſe*, they put in *a ſeeming neutral*, to keep houſe for them; the poor owner ſeeks *his poſſeſſion*, & complaines of this *uſurpation*, O ſaith the new tennant and Robbers depute, I am no Intruder, I have a good right, I put you not out, but found your houſe empty. Now let *the Informer* uſe a litle honeſt application and anſwer his weightie *Querie*. 2. He asks, *why will thoſe diſpoſſeſt miniſters ſuffer the people to ſtarve, becauſe they have ſtept out of their charges. Ans.* The people are *ſtarved* & *poyſoned too* by thoſe that come in; & theſe Miniſters are concerned upon their faith to the *great ſhepherd*, to endeavour what they can to ſave his lambes from the wolves, and give faithfull Miniſterial warning of their *flocks hazard*. Next, he tells us, *though a miniſter be tranſported againſt his will, yet the people ſhould ſubmit to his ſucceſſor.* True, when for the Churches greater good, he is tranſported to another watchtower by her faithfull guides, and true Church Judicatories, but not when the true paſtour is chaſed away by uſurping perjured Prelats, and an *intruding hireling* brought in as *their vicar*. Its this mans *perted ſelf* (to uſe his own phraſe here) that blurrs his eyes to draw a *ſimilitudinar argument* from ſuch an *abſimilar inſtance*. One thing he did well to add as a proviſo, viz

*the ſucceſſors coming in upon an orderly or fair call.* And doth this man think that Conformiſts have this *orderly call* according to the Reformation and doctrine of this Church? Nay, is he not diſputing againſt this call, and ſo if this be „ a neceſſary condition of a Miniſters Lawfull ſucceſſion, the *Informer* is in the briers of a palpable inconſiſtency near of kin to a contradiction. As for what he adds „ of the neceſſity „ of a Miniſtry, and making the beſt of what we can- „ not help in our ſuperiours, we ſay, that were the Rulers uſing their power for giving one *Lawfull paſtour* for another, and in the method of this Church, and according to the *ſcripture pattern, by Lawfull Church Judicatories*, theſe reaſons would ſay ſomething; but when they have overturned the Reformation of a Church, and contrary to that Churches vows and their own, are obtruding abjured prelats, and a number of profane hyrelings as their deputes, to exclude and ruine a faithfull Miniſtry, his reaſons in this caſe are naught, and ſpeak nothing to the point. As for what he adds afterward „ of Miniſters, in the year „ 1648 ejected for aſſerting their duty to the King, „ and their ſubmitting while others were put into their „ charges. I Anſwer, he will never while he breaths be able to prove, that they were depoſed for aſſerting their duty to the King, and not rather for promoting an ungodly courſe tending to the Kings ruine, and the ruine of our Reformation, and for other pieces of their ſcandalous miſcarriages, by the true Lawfull Judicatories of this Church. So that upon both grounds, the flocks were concerned to ſubmit to ſuch faithfull paſtours, as were ſet over them in the way and method of this Church, and according to the ſcripture pattern.

His laſt anſwer to this argument of his Doubter anent Conformiſts Intruſion is, „ that Presbyterian „ Miniſters

„ Miniſters intruſion, is from pariſh to pariſh over „ the Labours of all the Miniſters of Scotland, where- „ as Conformiſts intruſion (if it be ſo) is but over „ one pariſh. *Ans.* We told him before, that Preſbyterian Miniſters, notwithſtanding the prelats violence and uſurpation, are „ Miniſters of this Church „ of Scotland continuing ſtill in that relation to her; So that the preſent preſecution and violence, as well as backſliding of the Prelatick ſchiſmaticks and Innovators, warrands their more enlarged officiating by the ſame grounds, upon which the perſecute officers of the Church of Jeruſalem went *every where preaching the goſpel*, and on the ſame ground that Miniſters enlarged officiating in the time of our Reformation, was warranted; to which this caſe of defection is parallel and correſpondent. So that their *miniſterial obligation*, and the many *ſcripture commands as to diligence in their teſtimony*, Being by the preſent ſtate of our Church extended to their officiating in this manner, their Miniſtry is *no Intruſion*, but the Lawfull exerciſe of their office, received from the great ſhephered, nor is it upon the flocks „ who are under a tye and relation to „ the preſent Incumbents as their paſtours, but toward poor ſtarved flocks committed to wolves, who deſtroy but feed not; and the Curats pretended Miniſtry being neither of Chriſt, nor for him, is ſtill an uſurpation though over the ſmalleſt flock; ſo that his Inſtance of the pyrats word to Alexander, and citation of the Apoſtle's caveat Rom 2.21. is *extra oleas* and reaches himſelf a rebounding ſtroke. For who (I pray) have uſurped the name and authority of this Church, and endeavoured to have it compleatly moulded in their way, and to extirpat all faithfull Miniſters and profeſſors within the Nation, is it not 14 *uſurping Prelats and their underlings*, this is a robbery indeed, and with a witneſs.

Now

Now follows another argument of his Doubter [that Episcopal Ministers are abjured as depending upon the hierarchy, and therefore cannot be heard without breach of the Oath.] In what respects the owning of Conformists, especially as that practice is now circumstantiat, is a breach of Covenant, we have cleard above, and need not again repeat it. He answers. 1. *That Ministers are not mentioned in that article.* But if they depend *upon that Ecclesiastical hierarchy as Church Officers*, why are they not mentioned. Next, its enough for our purpose, that the owning of their Ministry *as depending upon prelats*, is in this our case abjured. 2. He tells us, *that dependance on that hierarchy doth suppose, and is to be understood of a hierarchy, made up of all the officers enumerate in that Article, as the English Presbyterians sense it, which hierarchy we have not in* Scotland. This conceit I have already confuted, and proved that beside this Article, we are by the first bound to *preserve the establisht Reformation and Government of this Church, and to adhere to all that enter* into this *Oath, in the pursuing of its ends*; and *not to suffer our selves to be withdrawen from this Reformation, and our union therein by terrour or persuasion*, is an obligation lying upon us in the 6. Article, which doth abundantly (as we have said,) reach the disowning of Conformists.

In the next place he tells us, *that to binde our selves to disowne Ministers depending upon Bishops, is to binde our selves to sin.* I Answer whatever may be said of such an engadgement *simpliciter* and absolutly considered, yet certainly to engadge our selves against *the reintroduction of Prelacy into a pure Church reformed from it*, and against *all dependers upon, and promoters of that Interest in such a Church*, in the capacity of Church officers, and *eatenus* as promoting and depending upon it, is both *a lawfull and necessary engadgment*, necessarly flowing from & dependent

dent upon the abjuration *of prelacie itself*. That Miniſters tho faulty may be heard, will (as we have oft demonſtrate) nothing help his concluſion. Since he cannot deny that their *faultineſs* in ſome caſes may barr *their being heard*, as he ſuppoſes Presbyterian Miniſters faults puts a Lawfull ſtop in the way of people's hearing them. Then he tells us, *that he hath ſhowen epiſcopacy to be a Lawfull government which none might Lawfully abjure*, for this we referr the Reader to what is anſwered on the *firſt Dialogue* where we have proven the contrary, and that it is a government contrary to the word of God, which therefore we were obliged to abjure.

Laſtly he tells us, *that by this expoſition of the 2. Article we were bound not to owne Miniſters who were in office at the taking of the Covenant, but to extirpat them ſince they depended upon Biſhops as to their ordination ſtill, even after they had taken the Covenant, unleſs they renounced their ordination received from Biſhops, and had been ordained a new by meer Presbyters, which they thought themſelves not bound to do by the Covenant, or they were Miniſters without a true ordination all that time, and then all their Miniſterial Acts were null ſince they proceeded from that ordination.* And yet (he ſayes) *we never ſcrupled to hear ſuch Miniſters notwithſtanding of this dependance upon Biſhops in part, if they diſowne Biſhops for the future.* *Anſ.* What a ſilly knack is it which all this tatle is founded upon, viz. *Miniſters who received ane ordination from Biſhops, or Biſhops with Presbyters, in a Church upon which they had uſurped, are ſtill to be lookt upon as Miniſters depending upon Biſhops, even after Prelacy is aboliſhed, and Presbyterian Government eſtabliſhed in that Church.* So poor a notion that I am ſure the leaſt reflection may diſcover its vanity, ordination being Gods ordinance and appointment, and the Biſhop *qua Presbyter* being veſted with a power in it, ordination by the Biſhop with

Presbyters (tho maim'd in respect of the Bishop's arrogated power, which is a corruption adhering to it) cannot by any good consequence be said to depend in its *esse* or *nature* upon the Prelat, and far less in *operari* or *esse* after that corruption is removed and abjured; and Presbyterian Government set up. Doth a souldier or Officers commission or Military power flow still from a Colonel after he is disbanded? Nay this is too gross inadvertency. Were *Zuinglius*, *Luther*, and other of our Reformers dependents upon the *papacy or popish Prelats* after their cleaving to, and embracing the Reformation? Do not all our divines distinguish the essentials of their ordination from *these corruptions adhering to it*, and assert that they had a Ministry Lawfull for substance, and an ordination to their Ministry, tho coming to them through that impure channell. This man Justifies the *Pope's plea*, where is your Ministry (saith he and the Romanists) you have no Ministry but what you have from us? do not our Divines tell them that the Ministry and ordination it self being Gods institution, we have them from the Lord, now restored and recovered from their corruptions, and are not dependers upon them for our Ministry? did all our Reformers Ministerial acts flow from *the pope or papal ordination* as such? Let our *Informer* take heed of this *præmunire*, for this dangerous error which he hath fallen into, will expose him to the severe censure of all protestant Churches. 2ly, Hence Ministers who were ordained by Prelats with Presbyters concurring, were no more bound (yea less bound) to renounce their ordination simply, then *Zuinglius or Luther* were obliged to renounce theirs; especially since their ordination was in a protestant Church, and under Prelats owning the protestant profession (which our *Informers* charity will no doubt esteem a considerable difference) and their not renouncing it *simpliciter*

will

will no more make them ſtill dependent upon the Prelates as to their Miniſtry, when prelats are removed, then *Zuinglius and Luther* were dependent upon the *Pope* as to their ordination, and the acts flowing therefrom, after their ſeparation from the Church of Rome, or infer that they did owe their baptiſm to the *Pope*, or the ordination of the popiſh prieſt who baptized them, and were concerned to be rebaptized. So that the popiſh cauſe and intereſt is much obliged to our *Informer*, if his pleadings for our prelacy wil hold good; and it is no bad *omen* that both intereſts are thus embarqued together in this man and his fellows reaſonings for them, and muſt ſtand and fall together, which fortifies our hope and confidence, that as the firſt hath begun to fall, ſo the other ſhall gradually decay, wither, and fall with it.

## CHAP. IV.

### *The* Informers *anſwer to the Doubters argument anent* ſeparation from a corrupt Church, *and the retorted charge of* Ichiſme *upon Conformiſts, examined.*

OUr Doubt-Reſolver will ſeem ingenuous in offering an anſwer to ſome chief objections againſt the owning of Conformiſts, and therfore puts into the mouth of his perſonat Doubter, ſome more arguments, in ſuch a mould as he ſuppoſes is for his beſt advantadge, which I ſhal now conſider, and deal faithfully with him and his ſuppoſed Doubter, in preſenting theſe arguments, (which he hath diſguiſed) in their genuine ſtrength, and ſhall examine his anſ-

wers, which when weighed in the ſcripture ballances and according to the true ſtate of this queſtion will no doubt be found as empty and inſignificant as any of the preceeding.

The Doubter hath another argument [that we are warranted by the word to ſeparat from a corrupt Church.] This objection he curtly and advantagiouſly propones, making his Doubter ſuppoſe 1. a confeſſed *ſeparation* in this practice, from a Church to which we are bound to adhere, which this new advocat has not as yet made good. 2. That any corruptions generally, or ſuch as may denominate a Church in ſome meaſure corrupt, will warrand a ſeparation, which is a principle we do not owne. We acknowledge a Church may be joyned with Lawfully wherein there are great corruptions, and this with Mr Durham and others on that ſubject. But as to corruptions, we ſay, if the contraverted joyning be in that which is clear and neceſſary duty in the preſent circumſtances, there can be in this joyning no ſtain, but in ſo far as a concurrence with that which is duty out of *that complex caſe*, cannot be performed without a direct complyance with, or ſtain of theſe corruptions, then a proportioned ſeparation is needfull in ſo far as ſuitable to that exigence; and yet even in this caſe we aſſert that other duties in the fellowſhip with that ſame Church may be owned: and that fellowſhip is not intirely to be broken off (upon the preceeding ground) in theſe things wherein there is no ſuch hazard. But now what ſayes he to this argument, 1. He tells us, *we are miſtaken if we think the Biſhops a corruption, and that this will not be granted. Anſ.* I hope I have made it evident that they are a corruption, and therefore to be diſowned. The 2 anſwer is, *that its a miſtake to think that for corruptions, and even great corruptions, a Church is to be ſeparat from.* Then he tells us, *of the corrupted doctrine*

*of the Church of Galatia; that in the Church of Corinth an article of the creed was denyed, that there were great faults in the Asian Churches Rev. 2. 3. and of the great corruptions that were in the Church of Israel, as is evident in the books of the Kings and Prophets, yet the people of God were not commanded to separat as long as the substance of the worship was not corrupted, as it was by Ieroboams calves.* Ans. 1. What if Presbyterians shall borrow this argument from him, and from these instances of not separating from a Church, notwithstanding of great corruptions, shall plead for all professors in Scotland their adhering to Presbyterian Ministers and this Presbyterian Church, as having *a worship not substantially corrupted*, whatever other *personal faults*, or corruptions they may be lyable unto, that yet they are a true Church as to the main, and that therfore they ought to be joyned with, as the Churches of Corinth and Galatia (wherein there were great corruptions) were still adhered to by professors. What will he say in this case? I know he will say that its ridiculous for such a party of Schismaticks to call our selves *the Church of Scotland*. But what if we return this answer to him again, that according to the Reformation and principles of our Church (out of which Prelats were ejected, vows against them universally taken on, and Presbyterial government compleatly setled therein) *Its* ridiculous to call *a party of Prelats and their adherents the Church of Scotland*, or for them to usurp her name, who have thus overturned her Reformation. So that untill he make good the above mentioned *hypotheses* or suppositions, viz. *that Conformists are the true organick Church of Scotland, that this our practice is a separation properly such; that its meerly because of Conformists personal faults, that we withdraw*; that we are *under prior obligations to adhere unto Curats with all their corruptions rather then our Presbyterian Ministry and Church*, which is both free of

them and contending againſt them; untill theſe and ſuch like ſuppoſitions be made good, his argument from the preceeding ſcripture Inſtances as to joyning with a Church that hath corruptions, is a meer *petitio principii*, and will not help his cauſe in the leaſt. Which will be further evident if we conſider in the 2d place, that the caſe of theſe Churches and profeſſors therein was far from ours in relation to corruptions. For

1. The *Doctrinal corruptions* of Galatia as to the legal Ceremonies, (by the bad influence of Judaizing teachers) tho they were of a large, yet the *Informer* will not prove they were either of ſuch an univerſal ſpread and tincture, or ſtrengthned by ſuch an univerſal acknowledgment, as to make the ſtate of that Church correſpond with his *hypotheſis* in this argument. 2. That error in the Church of Corinth in relation to the reſurrection, appears not to have been owned by their teachers and Church officers, far leſs publickly avowed and obſtinatly and preſumptuouſly maintained by them or any conſiderable number of hearers, which makes their caſe wide from ours, wherein ſo many preachers who call themſelves Paſtours of this Church, & many others, obſtinatly and avowedly maintain our abjured corruptions; the Church of Corinth was in capacity to cenſure any handfull that owned this error, & *to purge out this leaven*, but ſo is not our Church in this caſe as to the mantainers of Prelacy and its other corruptions, ſo that there is here no remedy but for the ſound part to keep themſelves pure from their contagious and deſtroying courſe. The account of both theſe Churches in the point of corruptions, which is exhibit by *Pareus in his Comment. on the* 1 *Cor.* is conſiderable to this purpoſe, upon the 12. verſe of the 15. chap. he tells us that the *Apoſtle accuſeth not them all, but ſome only*, freeing the reſt of this crime. *Neque enim accuſat omnes*

*ſed*

*ſed quoſdam inter eos. Reliquos igitur a culpa li' erat. Neque enim paucorum culpa omnibus eſt imputanda.* Thereafter he ſhewes „ that ſome do judge that this was *Hymenæus* „ and *Philetus*, others, ſome of the Jewiſhs Saduces or „ Heathen Philoſophers who had inſtilled this poyſon „ about the reſurrection. And a little after anſwering Bellarmines cavill, [that becauſe of theſe Churches their corruption in doctrine, therefore *pure doctrine* is not the marke of a Church] as the Churches of Corinth and Galatia were without the faith of the reſurrection, and ſound faith as to juſtification. He anſweres by denying this aſſertion. *Neque enim* (ſaith he) *tota Eccleſia Corinthiorum negabat reſurrectionis fidem: ſed aliqui tantum, quos redarguebant alij. Idem de Galatarum Eceleſia ſentiendum: qui nec omnes, nec tam enormiter errabant in fundamento, nutabant ſaltem, utrum fides Chriſti ad ſalutem ſufficeret ——— dicit enim ibidem, ut & Corinthijs: modicum fermenti fermentat totam maſſam. Ergo fermentum, non erat omnium ſed aliquorum tantum: a quibus tamen omnibus imminebat periculum, quod Apoſtolus tentat ab eis avertere.* „ That is, this whole Church „ of Corinth denyed not the reſurrection, but ſome „ only who were oppoſed by others, the ſame we „ muſt judge of the Church of Galatia, who did neither all, nor ſo hainouſly err in the foundation, but „ by the perſuaſion of falſe Apoſtles were heſitating, „ whether the faith of Chriſt was ſufficient to ſalvation, or if the circumciſion was alſo needfull, for „ he ſayes in that ſame place as alſo to the Corinthians, „ a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump. Therefore this leaven was not of them all but of ſome only, „ by whom notwithſtanding all were in hazard, which „ the Apoſtle endeavours to prevent. The Dutch annot. upon the ſame place [How ſay ſome among you &c.] obſerve „ that this error was not *common of the* „ *whole Church*, but *of ſome only* whoſe names are not expreſs

„ expreſt, as 2 Tim. 2. 17. that by ſhaming them he „ might not fright them from converſion. And upon „ Gal. 5. 9. they ſhew that this *little leaven* ſpoken of, „ may be either underſtood of the *falſe doctrine* it ſelf, „ or *the men* who promoted this doctrine, who al- „ though they were *few* yet did much hurt, —— and „ therefore were to be eſhewed. Now, how diſpro-portioned for extent and infection, theſe corruptions were unto theſe of our Church about which our debate is, is obvious to the meaneſt reflection, and conſequently the Lameneſs of our *Informers* ſimilitudinary argument from the one to the other. Which will be yet further evident, if we conſider. That

3. He cannot make appear, that in any of theſe Churches there was a formal legal *Judicial enacting authorizing and commanding* of theſe corruptions, and endeavours uſed, to exclude and root out all who would not ſubmit to them, by Barbarous violence and perſecution, particularly faithfull Miniſters for teſtifying againſt the ſame. Nor can he prove that adherence to theſe erroneous corrupters in their Worſhip, was appointed and enjoyned as an expreſs Teſt and badge of owning their errours, and renouncing the truth, and all the ſound party adhering thereto, which is ſo caſting a difference, that it quite invalidats theſe Inſtances as to any argument againſt our practice, for this deſtroying backſliding Innovating party of this Church have laid down courſes either to engadge to a *formal owning of their corruptions*, eſpecially the faithful Miniſtry of this land, or *elſe to exterminat and root them out & all ſound profeſſours together with their Teſtimony.*

In a word whatever concurence in duty theſe corruptions he mentions may be conſiſtent with, it is certain that the ſound profeſſors were called *to keep themſelves free of the contagion* thereof by all means, and the Church was to uſe all endeavours *to purge out* and rid

her

her ſelf of theſe *corruptions* and *corrupters too* if obſtinat, Paul wiſhed they were *cut off* who *troubled* the Churches of Galatia, that is cenſur'd and laid aſide as rotten members who were in hazard to grangrene the whole body. The Officers of the Church of Corinth are commanded *to purge out the old leaven*, ſince a litle would quickly *leaven the whole lump*. And the Apoſtle reprehends them for not caſting out the Inceſtuous man, & enjoynes the ſound profeſſors in that Church to come out from among the unclean and be ſeparat, as they exſpect to be received of God. And our Lord reprehends the Church of *Pergamus* for not caſting out them that held the Doctrine of Balaam, and the Nicolaitans —— and the Church of *Thyatira* for ſuffering Jezabel to ſeduce and infect with ſcandalous errors and practices the Lords ſervants. Now the ſcope of theſe precepts will ſay, that when the caſe is ſo circumſtantiat, that the Church and ſound part can have no acceſs for removing and cenſuring deſtroying corrupters, eſpecially while by violence endeavouring (after they have departed from a pure Church her ſworn Reformation and conſtitution) to force all to a concurrence with them, or exterminat the impolluted remnant, that this ſound Church (I ſay) are to keep themſelves free of their contagion, to follow their duty in oppoſition to them, and mutually to ſtrengthen one another therein; which is enough to Juſtifie our practice in this caſe. In like manner, the many commands of the Prophets *to abſtain from the pollutions of the time*, and threatnings for acceſſion thereto, will by proportion infer this our practice mentioned, and that when a caſe is ſuch that no concurrence can be had with Innovators in their worſhip without the ſtain of their ſin, and when they are perſecuting all that will not concur with them, a non-union and forbearance is moſt neceſſary. Had any corrupting treacherous prophets

Prophets or others of the Church of Iſrael in concurrence with perſecuting Rulers, *enacted univerſal complyance with ſome groſs corruptions, and ejected all the faithfull non complying teachers prieſts or prophets, admitting none to officiat except theſe corruptions had been formally acknowledged*, Let any ſay what would have been the faithfull prophets deciſion in this caſe, and whether upon the ſame ground on which they ſo oft dehort from the leaſt complyance with any ſin, they would not have allowed and commanded the faithfull prophets and members of that Church to oppoſe them, and cleave unto their reſpective duties, and unto one another in the following thereof. As for what he adds, *that there was then no command to ſeparat from the worſhip while it was not ſubſtantially corrupted.* I wonder if he will charge a *corruption of the worſhip it ſelf, or in the ſubſtance thereof* upon the duties now owned and performed by Presbyterian Miniſters and profeſſors, from whom he notwithſtanding thinks it's duty to ſeparat, ſo that untill he prove (as I ſaid) Conformiſts their better claim to officiat as Miniſters of this Church, then Presbyterian Miniſters, this argument lights heavy on himſelf, and the cenſures put upon Novatians and Donatiſts falls upon their *dividing and deſtroying party.* The caſe of theſe Schiſmaticks being as far from ours as eaſt from weſt; were Novatians or Donatiſts firſt caſt out by a violent backſliding party for not concurring in a courſe of backſliding, in overturning a Churches ſworn reformation, and were they enjoyned & commanded, to owne the courſe of theſe backſliders? I think the Donatiſts & Novatians their violence againſt adherers to the union of the true Church, is a fit emblem of the preſent practice of Conformiſts, how can this Man ſay, *that there were then greater corruptions then now.* Can there be greater corruptions in government then a papacy of the higheſt degree, as is their preſent

premacy and hierarchy? can there be greater corruptions *in practice*, then perjury and ſuch groſſe prophanity as Conformiſts are blotted with for the moſt part? greater corruption in principles, then *Popiſh Arminian* errors &c.

The Doubter objects, [ that if we may not ſeparat from a corrupt Church, what mean theſe ſcripture commands enjoyning ſeparation, ſuch as 2 Cor. 6. 14, 15, 16. 1 Cor. 5. 11 2 Theſ 3. 6 Rev. 18. 3 ] We have already ſaid that he deals deceitfully in making his Presbyterian Doubter aſſert that we may ſeparat *from a corrupt Church in every caſe*, but this we ſay, that in whatever caſe, and in how far ſoever; we cannot joyn with a corrupt Church without the contagion and ſtain of its corruptions, in ſo far and in that caſe, a ſeparation is neceſſary, and falls within the compaſs of theſe ſcripture commands. And that in this our caſe, the demanded conformity as to Presbyterian Miniſters and profeſſors cannot be yeelded, without the ſtain of prelatiſts their ſin, is above cleared. So that he needs not tell us here, *that every corruption is not a ſufficient ground of ſeparation.* For we have heard our *Informer* acknowledge *that a Church may be in that degree corrupted, as will render a ſeparation warrantable, yea and neceſſary.* I could wiſh he had condeſcended upon that degree of corruption, and ſhowen us here the *maximum quod ſic*, & *minimum quod non*, as to the ground of this ſeparation, and how far theſe corruptions may ſtrike at a Churches vitals, and yet her life and eſſence as a Church ſubſiſt. And here I would cloſe in a litle with this Man, and enquire, that ſince a Churches corruptions will (with him) in ſome caſes render a ſeparation neceſſary, upon what ground is it neceſſary, and from what prior principle is this concluded? ſure it muſt be upon this ground, *leſt union with that Church blott the ſoul, and make us ſhare in her ſin.* So that in this caſe, we are

not obliged to hold union and fellowſhip with her when it is infectious, as is moſt clearly imported in that command 2 Cor. 6. and if ſeparation be *upon this ground allowed*, whether the corruption be *leſſer or greater*, *eatenus or in ſo far*, we are obliged to ſeparat, for *Majus & minus non variant ſpeciem rei.* Next, I infer that a non-union to a *corrupt party* who cannot be called *the Church*, or at leſt whoſe being the Church is *magna lis & ſub judice*, will be *a fortiori* warranted, and upon leſſer grounds then *ſeparation* which ſuppoſes *an anterior obligation of union*, and *actuall union* out of this caſe, and abſtracting from it.

But for theſe ſcriptures mentioned, he ſayes they will not prove our point, and to that of 2 Cor 6. 14. he anſwers, *that our Lord is ſpeaking of ſeparating from ungodly fellowſhip with Idolaters, not of withdrawing from chriſtian aſſemblies.* But doth he not enjoyn that ſeparation becauſe of the *hazard of Infection by their ſin*, and why not alſo from chriſtian aſſemblies where there is *the ſame hazard of this Infection*? did he not acknowledge that the *caſe of a Church* or chriſtian Aſſembly may be ſuch, as will render even *a ſeparation neceſſary.* Now if in this caſe the tender ſeparater ſhould plead this text, and that corrupt Church or aſſembly of Chriſtians give our *Informers* anſwer, viz. *that it pleads only for ſeparating from fellowſhip with Idolaters, not of withdrawing from chriſtian Aſſemblies*, how will he extricat himſelf, and reconcile this anſwer with his conceſſion. But for theſe texts 1 Cor. 5. 11. and 2 Theſſ. 3. 6. he ſayes, *they are meant only of needleſs fellowſhip in privat converſe with ſcandalous perſons, but allowes not to withdraw from the publick worſhip becauſe of the preſence of ſuch ſcandalous ones, as if this did pollute the worſhip, though it may be the fault of Church guides not to keep them back.* *Anſ.* The ground here is the ſame (and acknowledged by him) whatever be the withdrawing which is more

more immediatly enjoyned, viz. *left their fellowship prove contagious, ſcandalous or in any meaſure ſinfull*, & ſo if fellowſhip with a Church in her Aſſemblies be *thus infectious*, theſe ſcriptures do enjoyn a ſeparation upon *the ſame ground*; and by neceſſary conſequence from what he hath acknowleged: And therefore this anſwer is nothing to the purpoſe, unleſs he will retract his conceſſion, *that there may be corruptions in a Church and her aſſemblies, which will render a ſeparation neceſſary.* Next, as for what he adds, *that ordinances are not polluted by the preſence of ſcandalous ones.* It is not for him, nor againſt us; ſince he acknowledges, there may be a *Lawfull* yea *neceſſary ſeparation from a Church & her aſſemblies in worſhip*, tho not upon *this ground* of the *ordinances their pollution by the preſence of ſcandalous ones*: becauſe of the reaſon which we have already heard; and we do alſo upon other grounds then this of a pretended pollution of the ordinances by their ſcandals, maintain our diſowning Conformiſts in their worſhip to be a duty (as we have heard) even that they are forcing all to a ſinfull complyance with them, in a ſchiſmatick departing from the unity of this Church and perjurious overturning the work of reformation, and will neither ſuffer Miniſters nor profeſſors to joyn with them in worſhip, but with an expreſs aknowledgement (in the intent of our Laws) and owning of this defection. Sure we are commanded to withdraw from every Brother that walks diſorderly, (which our *Informer* pleads as a ſufficient ground to diſowne Presbyterian Miniſters, & withdraw from them becauſe of their ſuppoſed diſorder and ſchiſm, tho the ordinances in their hands are not polluted with their ſuppoſed guilt,) and from all fellowſhip with ſcandalous brethren, which is contagious and may poliute us. Now, are not they *walking diſorderly* & croſs to the doctrine, diſcipline, & Reformation of this Church? are they not conſequently

ſchiſmaticks? are not their ſcandals infectious, when they will ſuffer no Miniſters to poſſeſs their charges, or officiat either with, or without them, or people to enjoy ordinances among them, without direct owning their defection, and overturning our Reformation, and a profeſſed ſubmiſſion to their abjur'd prelacy, as is clear in the acts enjoyning Miniſters preaching, and peoples hearing in conformity to prelacy and the ſupremacy.

For that of Rev. 18. he ſayes, *that it enjoyneth a ſeparation from Rome's corrupt doctrine and Idolatrous worship, but warrands not a ſeparation from a Church where no ſuch corruption is.* I anſwer, The ground of the command is *the danger of Infection* by Rome's ſins, as is expreſſed in the text, which will conſequently hold wherever this danger is, whatever be the *the particular ſins* from whence this danger flowes, for (as I ſaid) *majus & minus non variant ſpeciem*, and we may add, that other Known rule, *a quatenus ad omne valet ſequela.* In whatever caſe an union is unwarrantable and infectious, a proportioned ſeparation is upon this ground enjoyned. Nay, if the conjunction have but *mali ſpeciem* or be inductive to ſin only, the command *of eſchewing, every appearance of evill*, will reach this withdrawing, unleſs the conjunction be on other grounds an *indiſpenſible duty.* Now our Covenant obligations, and our Reformation as itſtood eſtabliſhed being duely pondered, it will be clear that Conformiſts are ſchiſmaticks and deſtroying Innovators, and there is no prior obligation to joyn with them, but rather to diſowne them in this courſe. Sure this man holds that *fellowship* with Presbyterian Miniſters *in their aſſemblies for worship is contagious*, and that people are obliged *to leave, and come out from them*, tho he dare not lay *Idolatrous worship nor corrupt doctrine* to their charge, and ſo he muſt acknowledge, that this and ſuch like commands will warrand

rand a ſeparation upon the general ground here intimat, abſtracting from that ſpecial caſe of Romes Idolatrous worſhip and corrupt doctrine. Its very ſophiſtical reaſoning from the denyall of *the ſpecial ground and nature of Romes contagion*, from which chriſtians are called to ſeparat, *to deny a ſeparation upon any other contagion* to fall within the compaſs of that precept, which is to reaſon from the denyall of the *ſpecies* to the denyal of the *genus*.

His Doubter in the next place retorts his charge of ſeparation upon himſelf, and alledges [that we have better ground to charge Conformiſts with ſchiſm becauſe of their departing from the government of this Church, to which we are ſtill adhering, ſo that they have gone out from us, not we from them.] We proved this charge already from the conſtitution and Reformation of this Church as it ſtood eſtabliſhed, and our univerſal vows of adherence therunto, ſo that ſuch as have overturned this work of Reformation, (not Presbyterian government only) they are properly the *firſt dividers and deſerters*.

But let us hear how he acquits himſelf of this charge. 1. He ſayes *that their ſubmiſſion to prelacy is in obedience to the commands of ſuperiors, whom we are bound to obey in things not ſinfull, So that their obedience is duty, and Presbyterians their non ſubmiſſion is diſobedience to authority, and Schiſme from the Church.* But 1. His Doubter alleadging that Presbyterial Government is *the Government of this Church*, and inferring thereupon that departing from it is *Schiſm*, and that Prelatiſts have gone out from Presbyterians, not they from them, which is a very clear conſequence, and will clearly infer the departers to be Schiſmaticks upon any deſcription of Schiſm which he can aſſigne; And moreover, this being the great ground upon which this man and his fellows do charge Presbyterians with

Schiſm, viz. That they are *ſeparat from the preſent Prelatick conſtitution*, ſince he offers no formal anſwer either to the antecedent or conſequent of his Doubters argument, what will the interpoſed command of Rulers ſignify to alter *the Nature of Schiſm*, or to make that practice which is *Hæſenus* upon Scripture grounds *Schiſmatical*, to be *no Schiſm*. This I muſt ſay is ſtrange divinity, but like enough to that of theſe men who make the Magiſtrate a Pope over the Church, her ordinances, and over ſacred Oaths and vows. 2. We have proved that their ſubmiſſion and obedience in this point, is a high rebellion againſt God, in diſowning at mens arbitrary command, the Government of his houſe appointed in his word, and embracing an abjured Hierarchy contrary to it, and againſt which all the nations were engadged. So that our practice is obedience to God, and a keeping of the union of Chriſts body, and theirs is both *perjury and Schiſm*.

He tells us, *that he hath proved in the firſt conference Epiſcopacie to be the only Government left by Chriſt, and practiſed by his Apoſtles: So that our diſowning it is Schiſm from the Scripture Church Governments, and that of the primitive Church, as well as from them.* To this I only ſay, that I hope we have made the prelacy he pleads for, appear to be a ſtranger both to Scripture and antiquity. Again he tells us, *that in this charge of Schiſm, he means it not only or mainly in reſpect of Government, but of ſeparating from their Aſſemblies for Worſhip, which is Schiſm tho the Government were wrong.* I anſwer 1. If he acknowledges that *ſeparating from the Government is Schiſm*, why anſwers he not our *countercharge*, that their party did *firſt ſeparat from the Government of this Church, and that therefore the Schiſm lyes firſt and principally at their door*; for that which he ſayes of *the Magiſtats command*, is (as we have heard) utterly inſignificant to wipe of this charge.

charge. 2. This charge of the *first Schism on his part* ſtanding good, for any thing he hath ſaid, that which he here adds *of our being Schiſmaticks, becauſe of our ſeparation from their Aſſemblies for Worſhip*, is likewiſe naught. For upon this ground of his Doubter, which he cannot diſprove, viz. That they have made the *firſt breach and ſeparation*, they are *Hactenus Schiſmaticks*, and ſo are to be diſown'd *in their worſhip upon that very account* and ground, upon which he pleads for diſowning Presbyterians Aſſemblies for Worſhip tho he can lay nothing elſe to their charge, or alleadge any *ſubſtantial corruption* of the worſhip. And ſo the recocted *crambe* which he here preſents to us again anent the Scribes and Phariſees, Simeon and Anna their attending the Temple Worſhip, Zacharias and Elizabeth, Joſeph and Mary their not ſeparating there from &c. Pleads as much for his Presbyterian Doubter in relation to the owning of our Presbyterian Aſſemblies for Worſhip (and much more) then for him. Since he dare not ſay that they are *more corrupted then the Church of the Jews was at that time*, and ſo we may echo back his *alas how will you juſtify this ſeparation of yours*, with an enquiry *how he and his party will juſtify their ſeparation from the true Miniſtry of the Church of Scotland?* What if a party of corrupt Prieſts and Levites had riſen up and purſued a courſe of defection, tending to raze and ruine all Gods ordinances, caſting out all ſuch Prieſts and Levites as would not concurr with them, and had appointed *an acknowledgment of and concurrence with their wicked defection*, to be *the only condition* upon which they will *admit either prieſts or people to ſhare in the ordinances? In the mean time a great body of Prieſts and people adhering to Gods ordinances, and contending againſt them, had been keeping their poſſeſſion of the temple Worſhip as long as they could?* I dare refer to our *Informer* to give judgment in this caſe and ſhew, what Simeon and Anna, Joſeph and Mary would have done, and to

which of the parties they would have adhered? And let our cauſe be judged by this.

His Doubter in the next place objects [that Conformiſts lecture not, & therefore may not be heard.] Here he but trifles to inſinuat that this is ſolely lookt upon by us as a ground of not owning them. But in ſo far as in this our caſe its a piece of their apoſtacy from our *eſtablisht reformed Worship*, and an expreſſe badge of *conformity to prelacy*, and in both theſe reſpects, *flat perjury and breach of Covenant*, we look upon it as having its own influence with other grounds to warrand a *non-union to them* while ſtanding in a ſtated oppoſition to faithfull Miniſters mantaining, this with other pieces of our Reformation. To this objection our *Informer* anſwers, 1. *That ſome Conformiſts lectured, and yet were ſeparat from.* And ſo might all of them be upon the forementioned grounds, thus diſowned and ſeparat from, Altho they had keept a form of this, but I beleeve they are for ſigns and wonders among them who keep the lecture, or owne it at all. Next he tells us, „ of the ancient reading of the Scripture „ in the Jewiſh Church, and of Moſes and the pro- „ phets in the Synagogues, Acts 13. 15, 27. and „ 15. 21. and likewiſe in the Chriſtian Church. But what then? who denies this, why, „ they have „ (he tells us) the Scriptures publickly read in their „ Churches. But I trow the *reading* is the better of *expounding*, and he might have found, that „ the Levites (Neh. 8. 8.) read the Law of God diſtinctly, and gave the ſenſe, and cauſed the people underſtand the reading; And he dare not ſay that the ancient publick reading of Scriptures among the Jews was by Gods appointment a dumb reading without expoſition. Why gave God *prophets* and *teachers* unto his Church if not for this end? and faith comes mainly by hearing the Word preach't. Why then

grew

grew his reverend Fathers and their conforming Sons, ſo angry with this Churches laudable practiſe of *giving the ſenſe together with the reading* (comprobat by that ancient Practiſe of the Jewiſh Church, which he pretends) ſince otherwiſe the Text read ane 100. times is ſtill like a kernell under a hard ſhell. Nay „ but he ſayes, if we ſeparat upon this ground we „ would have ſeparat from the Church in all ages. Sure not from that Church where the law was expon'd and its ſenſe given, as well as read, beſide that our non-union to our prelatick Innovators, (or withdrawing too if he pleaſe) hath this as an appendix with other grounds, that Conformiſts in withholding our former *lecture* or *expoſitory reading* from the people, and ſubſtituting a *bare reading* in its place, diſcover themſelves to be teachers who are *keeping cloſe* and not *opening the ſeals of Gods book*, & are afraid that their hearers ſhould learn too faſt.

In the 3d place, he tells us a tedious ſtorie, *anent the diſuſe of our firſt authorized method of Lecturing, which was at firſt only to read one chapter in the old teſtament and another of the New with brief explication of occuring difficulties, but that thereafter we held with one chapter, then with a part of one, and raiſed obſervations — making it a short ſermon, ſo that its all one to ſeparat for this, as to ſeparat for shorter ſermons, which are,* cæteris paribus, *thought better then a long.* Then he tells us further (to cloak this their lazineſs) *that variety of purpoſes are hardly retained, and procures á wearying, and that one thing puts out another* &c. But what fruitleſs talke is all this? If our Churches appointment was of this nature at firſt to open up difficulties upon the reading, did ſhe therefore intend to cut off the exerciſe of that gift anent practical obſervations, which is found in experience ſo eminently edifying as himſelf acknowledges in the next page, and the method of *preaching abroad*, to which method

we

we are beholden for ſome excellent commentaries upon the Scripture, which would probably have been by this time Intire through the whole bible according to the deſign and mould projected by the Reverend brethren and Miniſters of this Church, If our Prelats lazy reading tribe, had not invaded the pulpits of the Lords faithfull labourers. Again, ſuppoſe there was as to this method ſome deviation from the firſt appointment, yet ſince our Church gave a tacit approbation & univerſally uſed it, his cenſure is too critical & ſaucy; beſide, to plead from the variation in the practice to a total diſuſe, is dull reaſoning; and whatever the lecture was at firſt this is certain, that this univerſal practice and eminently edifying piece of publick duty, owned by our Church, was preſently diſuſed and diſcharged by prelats, and its diſuſe became one of the *badges of conformity*, and a part of their *mark* upon *their creatures*, and therefore *eatenus* in all reaſon it ought to have its own weight with other grounds, as to diſowning them, in their preſent ſtate and circumſtances. The experience of all the true ſeekers of God can diſprove ſufficiently what he adds, of *a tedious nauſeating* as the iſſue of *variety of purpoſes*; variety rather taking off, then begetting tediouſneſs whence the Scripture is compoſed for this end of ſuch a ſweet variety of purpoſes and methods. His ſtory of *Pembo's deſiring to hear one word or ſentence at once, and no more till after a long time*, is calculat well to patronize a reading or non-preaching Miniſtry; but the many ſcripture precepts given to chriſtians anent *growth in Knowledge, and leaving the firſt principles*, and not to be alwayes *children in underſtanding*, and likewiſe the ſcripture precepts ſtraitly charging and enjoyning Miniſters „ to be inſtant in ſeaſon and out of ſeaſon preaching, exhorting with all long ſuffering and doctrine, ſufficiently diſcovers the ridiculous tendency of this ſtory.

4. He

4. He tells us, „ that ſuppoſe it were a fault, every „ fault will not warrand ſeparation. We ſay not that every fault, nay nor this ſimply conſidered, will warrand ſeparation, but that this with many others preſumptuouſly maintained and avowed, will warrand a non-union unto a ſchiſmatick party of Innovators deſtroying and overturning a well reformed Church, and rooting out a faithfull remnant of adherers thereto. As for *the want of the circumciſion and the paſſover for ſometime in the Jewish Church*, which he next pleads as that which did not *cauſe a ſeparation*, not to ſtand upon the particular impediment of circumciſion while in the wilderneſs or an inquiry into what ſpeciall lets might have had an influence (or a ſinfull influence) upon the diſuſe of the paſſover, yet Conformiſts caſe, who are but a *ſchiſmatick unſound part of this Church*, rejecting an approved ordinance and duty, in complyance with and ſubſerviency unto a perjurious courſe of defection, is ſo far diſcrepant from this, that any may ſee the diſparity. As for that of 2 Kings 23. 22. „ That there was not holden „ ſuch a paſſover (as that of Joſiah) from the dayes „ of the Judges that judged Iſrael, nor in all the „ dayes of the Kings of Iſrael, nor of the Kings of Judah. Its only ſpoken comparativly in reſpect of the *ſpirituality and ſolemnity* of that paſſover, and doth not ſuppoſe ane abſolute diſuſe of this ordinance through all that time. A learned Interpreter upon this paſſage doth paraphraſe the verſe thus, „ that there was no „ paſſover celebrat with ſo ſolemn care, great prepa- „ ration, and univerſal joy, the greater becauſe of „ their remembrance of their miſerable times under „ Manaſſeh and Amon. —— And that from the „ dayes of Samuel the laſt of the Judges, as its ex- „ expreſſed 2 Chron. 35. 18. None of the Kings „ had with ſuch care prepared themſelves, the Preiſts and

„ and people to renew their Covenat with God as Jo-
„ ſiah now did. And as he will not be able to prove that out of the caſe of perſecution, invaſion, diſperſion or captivity, and the inevitable neceſſity flowing from theſe, there was a warrantable diſuſe of theſe holy ordinances, ſo profeſſors their not ſeparating from that Church even upon a ſinfull diſuſe, will never come home to his purpoſe, as is already oft cleared §. He adds, *that upon this ground we would ſeparat from all other Churches, and from our own Church before* the year 1645. And then he would pleaſe us again by telling us, *that he could wish all ſermons were as Lectures, the chief points of a long text being propounded, which would be more edifying, then when they rack the text and their brains* (a native and kindly character of his party, and their preaching) *to ſeek matter from their text to hold out the time*. But we have oft told him that its not *this defect only*, or without the circumſtances of our *preſent caſe*, that we plead as a ground of diſowning them. And if he account the Lecture-method of preaching the *more edifying*, with what conſcience have they deprived Gods people of this exerciſe & method of preaching, upon my Lord Biſhops orders? It ſeems his *ipſe dixit* is the *firſt rule of edification* with our *Informer* and his fellows, a principle well ſuited to lawleſs and Lordly prelacy, which muſt have all ordinances mancipated to its arbitrary commands. So that our *Informer* giving the ſupreme Magiſtrat a papal power over Church-Government, and ſolemn ſacred Oaths and vows, in the preceeding Dialogue, and the Biſhops a dominion over Worſhip in this, puts pityful fetters upon Chriſts glorious bride; and as in this point and moſt of his reaſonings, in begging the queſtion, he but skirmiſhes with his own ſhadow, ſo in thus wounding our Church, by his dangerous laxe principles in his pretended healing, but truely

truely hurtfull and trifling Dialogues, he ſhewes himſelf to be a phyſician of no value.

## CHAP. V.

*The* Informers *anſwers and reaſoning upon the point of* Scandal *and* offence, *in reference to the owning of Conformiſts, conſidered. His dangerous principles both as to civil and Eccleſiaſtick power in this point. His anſwer to the* Doubters *argument for Presbyterian Miniſters preaching in the manner controverted, taken from* the practice of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, *examined. His abſurd principles anent the Magiſtrats* coercive power *over the exerciſe of* the Miniſterial office.

Having diſcovered this mans unſoundneſs in the points above examined, wherein we have ſeen how in oppoſing the Lords work, his faithfull ſervants their laboures in promoting it, he hath daſhed againſt the Scripture and ſound divines, and ſtated himſelf in oppoſition to both. We ſhall next diſcover, ſome more of his errors, which, are the iſſues of the former, & of the wicked deſigne for promoting wherof, they are preſented. The firſt that offers it ſelf to be conſidered, is in the point of *Scandal*. From which we argue againſt the owning of Conformiſts as is above expreſt. And this grand doubt-reſolver will needs diſcuſſe it, but with what ſucceſs we ſhall preſently ſee.

His

His Doubter in the next place offers to him an argument againſt hearing Conformiſts, [taken from *the offence and ſtumbling* of many godly, flowing from this practice of hearing them, ſince they look upon it as a ſin; and tells him *that the Apoſtle ſayes we muſt not give offence nor lay a ſtumbling block before others.*] We have already propoſed, and ſome way improven this argument from the *ſcandal of the weak* in this caſe. To this he firſt anſwers, „ that when we are forbidden to „ give offence, Its meant of not doing that which is „ of it ſelf ſinfull, whereby we grieve the godly, and „ lay a ſtumbling block in the way of others by our „ evill example; but when we do our duty in obeying „ God, we cannot give offence to any, and if they „ take offence Its their own ſin and weaknes, but none „ is given. As here (he ſayes) „ its their weaknes to „ offend at maintaining unity and peace, that this ra- „ ther gives a good example, and to ly by from hear- „ ing Conformiſts for fear of offence of the weak, is „ to omit duty and harden them in ſin. *Anſ.* The *Informer* offering this reply from the ſenſe of that ſcripture generally hinted by his Doubter, ſeems at firſt view to reſtrict the command of not giving offence, to *that which is in it ſelf ſinfull*, wherin it might eaſily be made appear that he contradicts ſound Divines, ſcripture and himſelf. Eſpecially the paſſage to which the Doubter referrs being of a far other ſenſe and ſcope. But leſt this cenſure ſhould appear too Critical, and upon conſideration of his ſecond anſwer, I ſhall not medle with what he ſayes here in *theſi*, or this aſſertion in it ſelf conſidered. But to the aſſumption & application of this paſſage in his anſwer, I return to him this in ſhort, that he doth but here ſtill beg the queſtion in ſuppoſing that the owning of Curats is in this our caſe a duty and *a maintaining of peace and order in the Church*, wherof we have made the contrary appear:

and

and that maintaining the true union and peace of this Church, is to owne her true and faithfull Ambaſſadours, contending for her reformation, true order, and union againſt their courſe of defection: and ſo this practice is both ſinfull in it ſelf and ſcandalous to others.

His 2d Anſwer to this premiſed argument of his Doubter is, „ That the Apoſtle ordinarly when for-„ bidding to give offence, ſpeaks of the uſe of liberty „ in things indifferent, that it muſt not be uſed to „ the offence of the weak brother, leſt contrary „ to his conſcience he be emboldned to ſin, 1 Cor. 8. „ 10. Or be grieved becauſe he thinks we ſin in „ doing what we ſhould not, Rom. 14. 15. *Anſ.* We ſhall not much ſtand upon this, only we here ſee that the lawfulneſs of a thing in it ſelf, will not (according to him) Juſtify it in that caſe wherein, either the weak is emboldned to ſin, grieved, or made more weak and his plerophory hindred.

And that the ſincere enquirer for Truth may be confirmed in this ſound perſuaſion, and guarded againſt what he after ſubjoyns, I ſhall here offer unto him the ſenſe and Judgment of an eminent Father, and Reformed divine upon this point. *Chryſoſtome* upon Rom. 14. Homily 25. Expones all the Apoſtles Arguments to the ſame ſcope, of the unlawfullneſs of offending the weak in things indifferent. Particularly upon verſe 13. *Si non ſalvare fratrem* (ſaith he) *culpam habet, id quod & Evangelici talenti defoſſor indicat: Quid non faciet datum etiam ſcandalum? Sed inquies quod ſi ſuopte vitio ſcandalizatur infirmus? propter hoc ipſum æquum fuerit, ut illum feras, Nam ſi fortis eſſet, tali cura opus non haberet, nunc vero quia imbecillior eſt multa etiam curandi diligentia opus habet*, that is, if it be faulty not „ to ſave our brother, as the hider of the talent ma-„ keth

„keth it evident: What will not even the giving of „Scandal do. But you will ſay, what if the weake be „ſcandalized by his own fault? Upon the ſame very „ground it is juſt that you beare with him. For if he „were ſtrong then he would have no need, of ſuch care, „but becauſe he is weak he ſtands in need of much di„ligence for his cure. In the next homily, he hath „many things upon the reſt of the Apoſtles argu„ment to the ſame purpoſe. Upon the 14. ver. I *know nothing is unclean of it ſelf.* He offers an objection to the Apoſtle for clearing the words. *Quid igitur non corrigis fratrem, ne putet aliquid immundum eſſe? Ut quid non illum ab iſta conſuetudine omnibus viribus abducis* „Why do you not with might and main withdraw „your brother from that opinion and practice (a thing that our *Informer* and his fellows make no bones of as to diſſentients.) To this he anſwers in the Apoſtles name. *Veteor inquit, ne mœrore illum afficiam unde & ſubdit: Verum ſi propter cibum frater tuus contriſtatur, non jam ſecundum charitatem ambulas. Vides quo modo familiarem interea ſibi faciat infirmum Auditorem, oſtendens tantam illius rationem habere ſe, ut ne mœſtum reddat, etiam quæ vehementer erant neceſſaria, præciperere non audeat, ſed indulgentia illum magis ac dilectione attrahat? Neque enim poſtea quam vanum exemerat metum, potenter illum trahit aut cogit, ſed ſui ipſius Dominum eſſe permittit,* „that is. „I am afraid leſt I make him ſad, and „hence he ſubjoins, but if thy brother be grieved „with thy meat, now walkeſt thou not charitably. „See how tenderly he deals with the infirme hearer, „ſhewing that he hath ſo great a regard to him, that „leſt he make him ſad he dare not command theſe „things that are moſt neceſſary, for he he doth not „draw and force him after he hath taken away the „groundleſs fear, but permits him to be his own „Maſter. And upon the 1 Cor. 8. v. 20. He hath

many

„ things to the purpoſe. On verſe 9. *Non dixit quod licentia veſtra offendiculum ſit, neque certo aſſeveraverit ne impudentiores faceret. Sed, inquit, videte: timore eos abducit, & ne faciant prohibet: Et non dixit ſcientia veſtra, quod majoris eſſet laudis, neque perfectio veſtra: Sed licentia quod ſuperbiæ & ſtultitiæ -- non dixit fratribus ſed infirmis fratribus, ut gravius eos reprehenderet quod neque infirmis parcunt & maxime fratribus.* „ That the Apoſtle imputes „ folly and pride unto them who offend the weak bre- „ thren. Upon the 10. verſe -- the conſcience of him that „ is weak ſhall be emblodned to eat &c. He ſhews „ that the offender of the weak cannot charge the „ guilt upon his weakneſs — *tu enim imbecilliorem facis duo ſunt quæ te privant venia, & quod infirmus & quod frater -- addatur & tertium maxime horrendum -- quod Chriſtus neq; mori propter illum recuſavit, tu autem neq; ei indulgere pateris.* That is, „ the offender makes them „ yet weaker, that two things render ſuch as offend „ them inexcuſable, the one that they are weak, the „ other that they are brethren, and a third crime „ may be added, which is moſt horrid —— that „ thou refuſes ſo much as to ſpare thoſe for whom „ Chriſt refuſed not even to dye.

Upon 12. verſ. When ye ſo ſin againſt the brethren & wound their weak Conſcience ye ſin againſt Chriſt. He hath theſe words, *quid homine inhumanius excſtimari poteſt, qui ægrotum verberat? Et enim omni plaga gravius ſcandalizare eſt, nam ſæpenumero & mortem adfert. Et quomodo in Chriſtum peccant? Uno quidem modo, quod quæ ſervorum ſunt ipſe pro ſe accipit. Altero autem, quod in corpus ejus & membra faciunt qui percutiunt. Tertio quod opus ejus, quod propria morte abſolvit, ii propria ambitione deſtruunt.* „ What can be more inhumane then „ that man, Who beats one that is ſick? for to ſcan- „ dalize is more grievous then all ſtrokes for it often- „ times brings death. And how ſin they againſt „ Chriſt? One way, becauſe he takes to himſelf what

„ concerns his ſervants; another way, becauſe they „ wound his body and members, Thirdly, in that „ the work which he accompliſht by his own death, „ they deſtroy by their own ambition. Upon the laſt verſe of the chapter, „ If eating of fleſh make my „ brother offend I will eat none while the World „ ſtands. He ſaith, *Hoc Magiſtri optimi eſt officium, ſuo exemplo erudire quæ dicit, Et non dicit ſive juſte, ſive injuſte: ſed quomodocunque. Sed non dico, inquit, Idolothytum, quod & propter aliam cauſam prohibetur: ſed ſi quod licet & permittitur ſcandalizat, etiam illis abſtinebo, neque una aut altera die, ſed toto vitæ tempore. Non enim manducabo, inquit: carnes in æternum. Et non inquit, ne perdam fratrem: Sed ſimpliciter, ut non ſcandalizem:* That is, „ this is the duty of the moſt excellent Ma- „ ſter to inſtruct what he ſayes by his own example. „ And he ſaith not I will not eat whether juſtly or „ injuſtly: But whatever way I will not. As alſo he „ ſaith not that he will not eat of the Idolothyt which „ is forbidden for another cauſe. But if that which is „ lawful and permitted give ſcandal, even from theſe „ things I will abſtain, and not for a day or two, but „ during my whole life. For he ſaith I will not eat „ fleſh while the world ſtands. And he ſaith not leſt „ I ſhould deſtroy my brother: But ſimply leſt I ſhould „ offend him. And a little afterward having ſhown, that what the Apoſtle ſpeaks belongs unto us. he ſaith, *dicere enim quid mihi curandum eſt, ſi ille ſcandalizatur, & ille perit? Crudelitatis illius atque inhumanitatis eſt: Atque tunc quidem ex eorum, qui ſcandalizabantur, infirmitate id contingebat. In nobis autem non itidem; Talia namque peccata committimus, quæ etiam fortes ſcandalizant: Nam cum percutimus, cum rapimus cum trahimur cupiditate, & tanquam ſervis liberis abutimur, nonne hæc ſufficientia ſunt ad ſcandalizandum? Neque mihi dixeris illum calceorum ſutorem eſſe, alterum Corearium*

Statu-

*Statuarium vero alium: Sed considera fidelem illum esse & fratrem. Illorum namque sumus discipuli Piscatorum, Publicanorum, tentoriorum Opificum: Christus enim in fabrili domo educatus est, & fabri sponsam matrem habere non est dedignatus, & ab ipsis incunabulis in præsepi jacuit, neque ubi caput inclinaret, invenit: Et tantum iteneris confecit ut fatigaretur & ab alijs victum accepit.* That is, „ for „ to say, what am I concerned if such a man be scan- „ dalized, and such a man perish? is his inhumanity „ and cruelty: But some of those who then were scan- „ dalized, were offended through weakness, But soit „ is not in us: for we commit such sins which do even „ offend the strong. For when we strike, and offer „ violence to them, and are drawn by our own lusts, „ and abuse free men as if they were slaves, are not „ these sufficient to scandalize them? Say not to me, „ this man is a Shoemaker, the other a Tanner, the „ other a statuemaker, but consider that he is faith- „ full, and a Brother. For we are the Disciples of „ those fishers, Publicans, and tentmakers. For „ Christ was educat in a tradsmans house, & disdained „ not that his mother was betrothed to a tradsman, „ and himself lay in a manger for his cradle, neither „ found he where to lay his head: Was wearyed with „ his journey, and received maintainance from others. In which passages, it is evident that Chrysostome upon the great moral and Apostolick grounds, of the weak their intereſt in Christ, his tenderness of them, his dying for them, their spiritual hazard while their conscience is wounded, their liberty in Christ, the cruelty and uncharitableness of offending them, demonstrates the hainusness of, & vehemently inveighes against this sin, and clearly asserts with the Apostle, that the lawfulness of the practice in it self, affords not the least warrand for doing of that out of which

ſeth, or whereby the weak brother it made more weak.

Next, I ſhall offer the ſenſe of an eminent *Reformed divine* upon this point. *Pareus* upon this chapter doth fully confirme our principles on this head. Let the *Informer* read his analyſis of the chapter, where he will find him digeſt the Apoſtles reaſons and arguments againſt the giving offence in matters lawful, and learndly proſecutes them in his expoſition, which he will find to be ſuch as do cut the ſinnews of the new and dangerous principles in this point, which the Prelatick formaliſts do maintain, citing Chryſ. in ſome of the paſſages mentioned. Which purpoſe he alſo proſecutes in his commentary upon Rom. 14. and 15. Chap. Upon the 7. verſe anent *the pollution of the weak conſcience*, he ſayes *that this pollution is not ſo much to be imputed to themſelves, as unto thoſe that did induce them to eat by their ill example.* Upon the 9. verſe he ſhews that *the lawfulneſs of their practiſe excuſeth not abuſe in this caſe*, calling ſcandal, *dictum vel factum quo alius deterior redditur*, citing Rom. 14. 21. Upon the 10 verſ. he ſhews that the danger and guilt there pointed at, is *the inducing of the weak to imitat the practice with a fluctuating conſcience.* Upon the 11. He ſhews that the Apoſtle puts together aggreging circumſtances of this ſin of giving offence in things lawful viz. *that we ought to edify and not deſtroy by our knowledge*, next that *the perſon ſcandalized is our brother.* 3. *An infirm brother, whom to wrong muſt be extreme malice*, 4. Which is the greateſt of all, *that Chriſt hath dyed for the infirm brother.* The ſame he reſumes upon the 12, verſ. and explains the ſenſe of Chryſoſt. and Beza as to the wounding of the weak conſcience. Upon the Apoſtles concluſion verſ. 13. He ſhewes that he expreſſeth *a reſolution of the ſame nature and extent with that Rom. 14, 21. viz. not to do that whereby our brother ſtumbles, or is offended or is made*

*is made weak.* Adding, *idem vult intelligi de toto genere rerum mediarum & licitarum, potius in his se libertate sua cessurum, quam ut fratrem offendat. Sic thesin tacite ingerit quæ est presentis loci doctrina præcipua: In casu scandali etiam a rebus licitis abstinendum esse: Quia tunc sunt illicitæ & peccata, per accidens quidem sed nostra culpa, quando quod facere possumus ac debemus, (N. B.) offensionem infirmorum non cavemus.* That is, „ the same he will „ have to be understood of all things lawfull & indifferent, that in these we ought rather to cede from „ our liberty then offend our brother. Thus he tacitly „ enforceth that point which is the chief Doctrine of „ this place. That in the case of scandal we must abstain „ from things lawfull, Because then they become sins „ and unlawfull by accident, yet by our fault when „ we guard not against the offence of the weak, which „ we can and ought to do. In the close he sayes, *that the Apostle will have us in things lawfull not simply to eye what is our right, but what charity and edification do require,*

But now let us come to the assumption and application of our Informers concession, to the present case and question, are there not many weak brethren who may be emboldned to sin, or (may we suppose) condemn me sinfully if I hear Curats? Suppose the practice were lawfull in it self, what will cure this malady? Behold a *Catholicon* presently, *We must know* (saith he) *that if the command of Authority interpose & enjoin the thing Indifferent, then its no more in my liberty* pro tunc. *Because* (forsooth) *I am restricted by Authority, which makes the thing necessary.* *Ans.* 1. This man charges a great defect upon the Apostle Paul who in all his discourses upon guarding against offence in things indifferent, makes no mention of this new case & knack, anent *making the indifferent thing necessary, by the command of Rulers, and exeeming thus the giving of offence from guilt?* But all along he pleads by many arguments in the pla-

ces mentioned, that if the thing be *indifferent*, the caſe of *offence* makes it unlawfull. And all his arguments in theſe paſſages, which do preſs the eſhewing of offence are moral and conſtantly binding (and conſequently admit no ſuch reſtriction as this) ſuch as Chriſts tenderneſs of the weak, their redemption purchaſed by his blood, Chriſtian liberty, the evill of my brothers doubting, whatſoever is not of faith is ſin &c. And he moves objections againſt his doctrine, ſuch as, I have knowledge; I have faith —— And ſhall I be limited of my liberty, becauſe anther is weak or wilfull &c. Such like objections he moves and anſwers, but of this exception and reſtriction anent *a command from Rulers altering the nature of the thing*, and looſing all his arguments in relation to offence, the Apoſtle mentions nothing.

2. This puts a blaſphemous authority, upon the Magiſtrat; we know the terrible interminations and threatnings thundered againſt *giving offence*, and diſcoveries of the dreadfull tendency thereof, *wo to them by whom offence comes*, Again, *better be caſt into the ſea then offend one of the little ones —— deſtroy not him*, ſaith Paul (with thy offenſive carriage) *for whom Chriſt dyed*. Now will the Magiſtrats command give me ſufficient warrand and ſecurity in and for a thing indifferent, *to deſtroy my brother*, and will it lift off Chriſts *wo* and make it lighter then a feather, which is more dreadfull then to be caſt into the ſea with a milſtone tyed about ones neck.

3. I would know if this *Informer* will deny that the Apoſtolick precepts in relation to offence & ſcandal, preſſed with important and great motives in the premiſed Scriptures; are of *ane univerſal and moral nature*, and do reach and oblige *all that owne the profeſſion of Chriſtianity* in *their ſeveral relations and capacities*. Theſe precepts founded upon the everlaſting and conſtantly bi nding

binding grounds and motives of union, *charity* and *love to the brethren* (the great gospel command) *edification*, *the communion of Saints*, (the very bonds and ligaments compacting and strengthning Christs mystical body) none can deny to be of an universal extent, and to be among the grand rules of Christian practice limiting and directing our carriage *in whatever relation* we stand, whether Ministers or people, Masters or servants, Parents or children &c. And the superiour being under the obligation of these great rules (unless we will make God a respecter of persons) it necessarily followes that they do direct and limit him *in the exercise of his power*, so that this being one *Regula Regulans* as to all the Magistrat Laws; its must absurd to imagine that his counter-practice and Laws can loose himself or others from this divine superiour obligation, unless we will deifie him and make his Law & practice the soveraign and supreme rule in every point as well as in this. Whence it followes by necessary consequence that the practice which is offensive, scandalous, and destructive to our brother, in its present circumstances, and upon the constant unerring scripture grounds & rules, cannot be altered in its present quality and state by mens commands crossing the divine Law, but remains a sinfull scandalous practice though a hundred Lawes enjoyn and authorize it.

4. Was not Pauls Apostolick declarator that *every thing sold in the shambles might be Lawfully eaten*, as powerfull to exeem that action of eating such things from the compass of offence as the *Magistrats Law* and *authority*? Sure he had at least as much, if not more authority in this point, then the Magistrat, especially as this *Informer* expones *authority* afterward from Acts 15. 28. yet that same practice, Lawfull in it self, and by the Apostle declared to be so, and accordingly enjoyned and authorized by him, must not be used in

this case of the offence, even of the weak and ignorant, but the Apostle himself, though thus declaring and, (may I say) authoring the lawnes of the practice, declares he will never use nor take it up in this case of offence. I beseech him, was not the warrantablines of this practice in it self by the Lords word, declaring all things to be clean to the clean, and Pauls Apostolick declarator in this place, as valide to render it, of indifferent, necessary to the users, as the command of our civil Rulers in relation to this practice under debate, and a litle more, he having the mind of Christ, and being a Master builder of the Churches. Yet the offending of the weak, ignorant yea or wilfull, will in his Judgement cut short this liberty, and render the practice sinfull upon that ground. But moreover the instance of the brazen serpent will here bite and sting his cause and argument to death; for it was an eminent type of Christ, and reserved (and sure our *Informer* will say warrantably) as a signal monument of that rare typical cure of the people stung by the fierie serpents in the wilderness, yet when the people were stumbled, and it became an occasion of their sinning and committing Idolatry, good Hezekiah brake it, called it *Nehushtan*, and is commended for it by the Spirit of God. Now in this mans principles the interposing of authority for its preservation was sufficient to keep it from being destroyed, though all Israel should have been never so much stumbled, and ensnared to Idolatry by it, but the keeping of this monument God would dispense with in this weighty case. Sure that which rendred the preservation of it highly provoking, and Hezekiahs breaking of it commendable, was its stumbling and ensnaring tendency and effects, whatever authority and acts might have interposed formerly for its preservation. Will the *Informer* say

that

that Gideons ephod (which in his intention was only designd for a monument of that victory over the Midianites) was lawfully preserved when it became thus ensnaring as the brazen Serpent, or that the preservation of it was lawfully authorized in this case? surely he will not for shame assert this, and so the case is here; and he may see in these instances (if his eye be single) that a practice though in it self lawfull or indifferent, yet, when become offensive in its present circumstance and inductive to sin, cannot in that case be rendred warrantable by any Laws of the Magistrat.

Finally, our *Informer* in this assertion confuteth sound Divines and Casuists as well as the Scripures, yea and fights with himself. For we have heard from *Chrysostom* and *Pareus* (who are herein accorded by all our writers) that the action which is in its present state and circumstance, *scandalous*, is, while cloathed with these Circumstances, *necessarily evill*, and upon many weighty grounds *severely prohibited* by the spirit of God in the Scriptures forecited. So that no power and *Laws men of* can remove these *scripture limits & marchstones*. Next, the great ground and rule anent a scandalous action, and upon which the scripture motives against it are grounded, is the state, condition and freedom *of the conscience*, left it *be hindred in its plerophory*, *emboldned to judge without ground*, and the person *hindred to act in faith*, or *induced to act against it* &c. So that to assert that the Magistrats command can *invalidat these grounds* and principles, and render the action *not scandalous* which *is such otherwise*, is to give him *a Dominion over the conscience*, and subject it *immediatly* and *absolutly* to his Laws, which is a principle disowned by all Protestants. Moreover the *Informer* himself defines the offence of the weak brother in things indifferent, *an emboldning him to sin contrary to his conscience*, or *to judge that we sin when we sin not*, citing 1

Cor. 8. Rom. 14. Now if the action be upon *this ground* & principle *neceſſarily ſinfull* in its preſent circumſtances, how (I pray) can the Magiſtrats command render it not only *Lawfull*; but *neceſſary*, as he is bold to aſſert. Can the Magiſtrat by his Law embolden a mans conſcience to ſin, and yet neither the Magiſtrat ſin himſelf, nor the man ſin in obeying him? Ameſius a better Caſuiſt then he will tell him (*de Conſc. lib. 5. cap. 11. Quæſt. 6. R. 6.*) that *nulla authoritas humana, vel tollere poteſt ſcandali rationem, ab eo quod alias eſſet ſcandalum, vel peccati rationem a ſcandalo dato.* That is, „ no „ humane authority can take away the nature of ſcan- „ dal from that which otherwiſe were a ſcandal, or „ the nature and cauſe of ſin from ſcandal given. And his ground is very conſiderable, which doth confirme what I have now ſaid. *Nullus enim homo* (ſaith he) *poteſt vel charitati & conſcientiis noſtris imperare. vel periculum ſcandali dati præſtare.* That is, „ for no man „ can put imperious commands either upon charity „ or our conſciences, or exeem from the hazard of „ ſcandal given.

But now to fortify this raw & ignorant aſſertion as to ſcandal, our *Informer* brings Act. 15. 28. —*theſe neceſſary things* —— from which words of the Councils ſentence, he drawes one argument thus, that *though of themſelves they were not neceſſary, but ſomtimes indifferent, yet by the Authority of the council they were made neceſſary for the good of the Church, ſo* [he ſayes] *obedience to authority preponderats the not giving offence, as the greater duty of the two, as divines and Caſuiſts shew, and in this caſe the man who thus obeyes gives no offence, but doth duty. and if any take it, its cauſeleſs on his part, and occaſioned through the brothers weakneſs, ſo that its* ſcandalum acceptum non datum. *groundleſly taken but not given, and when the Apoſtle forbids to uſe, our liberty to the offence of the weak, he ſpeaks to thoſe who were not determined by Authority.* Anſ.

What

What poor ignorant and incoherent reaſoning is this, 1. Its a ſtrange ſottiſh or rather popiſh Aſſertion, that the *neceſsary things* Acts. 15. 28. were made ſo *by the councils authority*: For the text is moſt expreſs, that the Apoſtles enjoyned this upon weighty ſcripture-grounds, and *what ſeemed good to the holy ghoſt* (ſpeaking in the word) as well as to them, ſo that the holy ghoſts grounds and commands touching the maintaining of love, and union in the Church, and the great rule of *edification*, and *not ſtumbling the weak Jews*, were the great and ſtanding Scripture principles upon which this decree was grounded.

Now to ſhew how our *Informer* takes the papiſts here by the hand in this gloſſe, let us hear Calvine upon the place --- [*præter hæc neceſſaria*] *Hujus vocis prætextu ſuperbe triumphant Papiſtæ, quaſi hominibus liceat ferre leges quæ neceſſitatem conſcientiis imponant --- quia quod decernunt Apoſtoli neceſſario ſervandum eſſe pronuntiant* ——— *i. e.* „ the Papiſts triumph proudly upon pretext of this „ this place, as if men might make Laws impoſing a „ neceſſity upon Conſciences becauſe what the Apo- „ ſtles decree, they aſſume, muſt be neceſſarily kept. „ ——— Then he adds, *atqui expedita* &c. „But the „ Anſwer is eaſy to ſuch a fooliſh cavil (ſo he cenſures „ our New Caſuiſt and his fellowes in this point) for „ this neceſſity was no longer vigent then there was „ hazard of diſſolving union, ſo to ſpeak properly it „ was an accidental or extrinſick neceſſity, which had „ place not in the thing it ſelf, but in guarding of of- „ fence --which (ſaith he) is evident in the ſpeedy lay- „ ing aſide of this decree. Then he tells us, that when „ the contention ceaſed ----- Paul ſhewes that no- „ thing is unclean, and again eſtabliſhes this liberty „ Rom. 14: 14. And commands to eat freely what „ ever is ſold. Adding, that the papiſts in vain do ſnatch an occaſion to bind conſciences from this word

and

„ and to conclude the Churches power to ſtatute any „ thing beſide the word of God. Telling us further, „ that from the word of God the Council drew this „ ground of exerciſing charity in matters indifferent. „ Then (ſaith he) *in ſumma*, the ſumm is, if charity „ be the bond of perfection, and the end of the Laws „ if Gods command be that the faithfull ſtudy mutual „ unity and concord, and that every one pleaſe his „ nighbour to edification, none is ſo rude who may „ not perceive, that what the Apoſtles here comman- „ ded is containd in the word of God. —— And at the cloſe he tells us, *Apoſtolos ex verbi Dei finibus minime egredi.* —— „That the Apoſtles would not ſtep „ beyond the limits of the word of God.

But 2. This mans Babyloniſh tongue ſtill wounds himſelf as well as the truth, for 1. he acknowlegeth that what the Apoſtles here decreed, *was for the Good of the Church*; which (if he underſtand any thing) he muſt needs take it according to the grounds laid down in this diſquiſition, ſpecially that which the Apoſtle James propoſes immediatly before his and the reſt of ths Apoſtlee deciſion verſ. 21. viz. *that Moſes had in every city, them that teach him being read every Sabath day.* So that it was needfull at that time upon the grounds of charity, union, and ædification, to bear with the weak Jews in abſtaining from theſe things diſcharged by Gods Law, till the ceremonies were honourably buryed. Hence it followes clearly that this abſtinence was made *neceſſary* upon theſe *weighty grounds* at this time, and not by the authority of the council only. Neither was the matter enjoynd, of a thing indifferent, made neceſſary, by *their determination*, but upon theſe grounds, and for the great end of the *Churches good*, which he mentions, this abſtinence was at *this time*, and *in this caſe neceſſary*; And by the Apoſtles declared to be ſo upon divine warrand

for

for what elſe will he make of that expreſſion, *It ſeemed good to the Holy ghoſt.* Again, Paul and the other Apoſtles had no power but to *edification*, nor any *dominion over the faith* of Gods people, and ſo acted nothing here *pro arbitrio* or *imperio.* So that their ſentence, was only a declarator of Gods minde anent that which was antecedaneouſly to their decree *hic & nunc* a neceſſary duty, although we deny not that the Apoſtles deciſion was to have its own weight in determining the Churches obedience. 2. He brings this paſſage to prove *that obedience to authority will preponderat the not giving of offence.* But ſo it is that the great ground of the Apoſtles deciciſion here is *the guarding againſt the offence of the weak Iews*, and obedience to this ſentence was in not giving offence, and upon this very ground Chriſtians were to abſtain from theſe meats, whereas he fooliſhly diſtinguiſhes in this point betwixt obedience to authority, and not giving offence, as diſtinct duties, and makes the *firſt* to overrule the *ſecond*, in plain contradiction to the text, which makes *the not giving offence*, to be the great duty, and the foundation of this obedience.

3. This charge will be the more conſpicuos, and the Informers inconſiſtent prevarications, in this point, if we conſider theſe things in the point of offence: 1. That every offence through weakneſs is not ſinleſs upon the offenders part. The *Informer* himſelf doth (with the Apoſtle) aſſert this, who in the very preceeding page from 1 Cor. 8: 10. & Rom. 14. tellsus, *that the Apoſtle will not have that which is indifferent, or lawful in it ſelf, uſed to the offence of the weak, or imboldening of their conſcience to Sin.* 2. That upon this ground it follows that, the *Scandalum acceptum*, or offence taken, as contra diſtinguiſhed by our divines from *Scandalum datum*, or offence given, is badly and to narrowly deſcribed from the ground-

groundleſs taking thereof, as if upon this account it were faultleſs upon the offenders part, it being certaine, that neither the lawfullneſs of the thing out of which offence ariſes, the good intention of the doer, nor mens commands, nor the weakneſs, yea or wickkedneſs of the takers of offence, will free the giver thereof from guilt, unleſs the action be in its preſent ſtate and circumſtances a neceſſary duty: for thus the diſtinction could have no place, and there were no *Scandalum datum* at all there being no ground to take offence, upon the takers part, and takeing this phraſe in the Scripture acceptation as there can be no reaſon of a ſinfull action properly. Nay though the effect ſhould not follow, the giver is ſtill guilty, as Peter was in giveing offence to our Lord, though that action could produce no ſinfull effect in him, for he ſaid to him *thow art ane offence unto me*. So that it is beyond debate with all ſound divines and caſuiſts, that any *dictum or factum*, action or word, upon which the formentioned effects may follow, if it be not *hic & nunc* neceſſary, is a *ſcandalum datum*. 3. That accordingly all ſound divines treating on this ſubject, in deſcribeing a *paſſive ſcandal* in oppoſition to that *which is given*, do not draw their meaſures or deſcription meerly from the *weakneſs* or otherebade diſpoſition of *the taker of offence*, but from the ſtate and condition of *the action it ſelf*, out of which offence ariſeth, which if not *neceſſary* in its preſent ſtate and circumſtances, they hold the ſcandall to be as well active as paſſive; Thus Mr *Gilaſpie* Engl. pop: cerem. Thus Ameſ: de Conſc: lib. 5. cap. 1. 3, queſt 3, Reſp. 1, 2. tells us, that, *in omni ſcandalo neceſſe eſt ut ſit aliquod peccatum*, in every ſcandal of neceſſity there is ſome guilt, becauſe it hath a tendencie to the ſpiritual hurt and detrimen. of our neigh-

bour. And describing *passive scandal*, which is without sin upon the givers part, he saves that this falls out, *cum factum unius, est alteri occasio peccandi, præter intentionem facientis, & conditionem facti*, that is „ when the fact of one is the occasion of anothers sin„ ning, beside the intention of the doer, and the con„ dition of the deed it self. He draws not his description from *the intention of the doer* only, but from the *condition of the deed it self*, which if tending to the spiritual hurt of our neighbour, is still an active scandal, and no authority of men can alter its natur or remove its guilt, as we heard him before assert. *Mr Durham* on Scandal, part. 1, chap 1. describeth scandal, that is taken only or passive offence, that it is such when no occasion is given, but when a man doeth that which is not only *lawful*, but *necessary*, exemplifieing this by the Pharisees carping at Christs actions Matth. 15: 12. and by that of Prov. 4. 19. where the wicked are said to stumble at they know not what. Thus clearly asserting that the lawfulness of the practice, will not wholly lay the guilt on him that takes offence, unless it be also necessary. 4. The *Informer* cannot deny, that this *necessity* of the action, must be evinced from clear *Scripture commands* and cannot be rationally inferred either from the *assertion of the practiser*, or the *commands of the Magistrat* simply, or any supposed *Ecclesiastick canon*, since this would evert the Apostles reasoning on this head. So that he is obleidged to evince the necessity of this practice controverted from other grounds then he hath mentioned, or this charge stands good against him, especially since (as we have said) the Apostles injunction which he mentions as to the free use of meats, was a greater *authoritative determination*; then any which he now alledges to render the practice necessary

ceſſary. And if a practice lawful in it ſelf, and corroborated by ane Apoſtolick precept enjoyning it, could not be lawful in the caſe of offence, farre leſſe can the conſtitutions he mentions make this practice lawful in ſuch a caſe. So that our Argument, *a Scandalo*, ſtands good againſt him upon this point, in anſwer to which he hath brought nothing but what is contrary to Scripture, caſuiſts, yea and himſelf.

The charge which he after exhibites againſt us, *of erecting ſeparat meetings in the houſes and fields* ——— *and of our being Schiſmaticks if ever the Chriſtian Church had any*, we let paſs among the reſt of this mans petulant aſſertions, the grouuds whereof we have examined and confuted. The people of God in obedience to Chriſts faithfull Ambaſſadours (by Prelats perjurious violence thruſt from their watchtowers) aſſembling to hear the great Shepherds voice, erect no *ſeperat meetings*, but keep the aſſemblies of *this Church* driven by them to a wilderneſs, whereof (if the Lord open not his and the reſt of his tribe their eyes) they will bear the ſin and puniſhment for ever.

The Doubter object next, [ Chriſts preaching in privat houſes and fields, and peoples hearing therein, inferring that ſo likewiſe may we. ] This argument our *Informer* (according to his uſual candor) diſguiſes, we ſay not that in a ſetled peaceable ſtate of the Church, [Miniſters may preach and people hear in this manner, but upon ſuppoſal of this Churches *diſturbed perſecute condition* by a party of prevailing backſliders, Miniſters preaching and peoples hearing, is warrantable upon the formentioned grounds; both Miniſters (upon whom our Prelats hands have been very heavy of a long time, yea (I may ſay) their litle finger thicker then their predeceſſours loins,)

and

ſters and people being in this broken deſtroyd ſtate of our Church chaſed, haraſſed, and denyed all ordinary places appointed for divine worſhip, nay ſcarce any place of reſidence in their native land free from the *fulmina* & thunderbolts of Prelats mad rage. But what ſayes he to this argument, he tells us 1. *That tho Chriſt preached thus, yet it was not to ſeparat from the Jewiſh Church, nor did he diſowne the hearing of their teachers, but allowed to hear Scribes and Phariſees with a (proviſo) to beware of their leaven ——— that he ſent thoſe who were miraculouſly healed to the Prieſts, and did not bid diſowne them.* Anſ. 1. Whatever be concluded as to Chriſts diſowning, or ſeperating the people from the teachers of the Church of the Jews at that time (wherin the *Informer* hath offered nothing which will amount to a demonſtration of what he affirmes, and his aſſertion tho granted will not fortify the concluſion he aimes at) yet this is certain and undenyable, (and in ſo far his Doubters parallel argument ſtands inviolable againſt him) viz. that our bleſſed Lord preacht after this manner which he condemns. Since he condemns *in univerſum* & ſimply Presbyterian Miniſters preaching, and peoples hearing them in this manner, abſtracting from the diſowning of Curats and their Miniſtry, ſo that this anſwer meets not the objection as levelled againſt his principles. And he cannot deny but that in ſo far as Chriſt and his Apoſtles were owned, their ordinary Jewiſh teachers were ſeparat from and diſowned, but he condemns all owning of Presbyterian Miniſters, and withdrawing from Curats, as ingraind Schiſm and ſinfull ſeparation. This anſwer is the more forcible, if it be conſidered that our Lord had liberty of their Synagogues to preach in, yet he frequently left them, and preacht in privat houſes and in the fields, and therefore Presbyterian Miniſters may uſe this liberty, whom (in a peice of cruelty be-

yond that of the Scribes and Phariſees to Chriſt) they have baniſh't from pulpits. 2. As for our Lords not putting people to ſeparat from that Church or the teachers thereof, we have already ſhown how far it is from his purpoſe, and what a wide conſequence it is, from a *non-ſeparation* from the Jewiſh Church, and teachers tho corrupt, (while that legal diſpenſation ſtood, which was ſhortly to be removed, and the Goſpel Miniſtry erected in its place) and from our Lords tollerance thereof as Gods ancient Miniſtry, though now corrupt, to which he was to put an honourable cloſe, to conclude that a people are to diſowne a faithfull Goſpell Miniſtry and Church, in complyance with a number of deſtroying Innovators ejecting them, and razing a ſworn Reformation, which all that Church are bound to defend. This is ſuch a palpable inconſequence, as any may upon firſt view diſcover it. 3. There was (beſide what is ſaid) this reaſon in ſpecial, wherefore our Lord would not have the Jewiſh Miniſtry at firſt univerſally left, becauſe he came as a Miniſter of the circumciſion to confirm the promiſes made to the fathers; he was to come to the temple as the Kings Son and Lord of all the Prophets who went before him, the Law being to go forth from Zion, and the word from Jeruſalem, Jeſus came firſt to his own. Therefore the Jewiſh Miniſtery and teaching, was to ſtand for a time to make this apparent, and as Chriſts great witneſs for his authority, and the Doctrine of the goſpel, either for their conviction or converſion; hence *he appeald* unto the Scriptures which they heard dayly read, and preacht, *Search the Scriptures for they teſtify of me.* And when he enjoynd the healed leper to go and ſhew himſelf to the Prieſt, it was to offer the Sacrifice which Moſes commanded *for a teſtimony unto them.* So that to make the ſubſtituting of the Goſpel to the

legal

legal dispensation and ordinances apparent, and its Ministry to the Jewish Ministry and Priesthood, to which Christs death and resurrection only was to put a final period, it was necessary it should be own'd in some measure. And Christ could not wholly disowne it without stopping a great part of his mediatory fulfilling of all righteousness, for he was as head of the circumcised people, and as of the seed of Abraham according to the flesh, to obey the Judicial and ceremonial Law, and therefore he duely attended the passover and all the solemn feasts, which could not subsist in their exercise, without the standing of that old Ministry; Now how far this is from our Question, and inferring the owning of Curats in our case, is obvious to the meanest capacity. What he sayes of hearing the Scribes and Pharisees, is already answered. But now this *Informer* will offer some special reasons of Christs preaching after this manner, to cut short our argument here; the first is, *Because he was to bring in the Doctrine of the gospel, and preach himself the true Messiah, which was needfull to be done, and because of the opposition of his doctrine by the Jewish teachers.* *Ans.* 1. Altho he was to bring in the doctrine of the Gospel into the world, yet as he was sent first and immediatly to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and to exercise his Ministry toward them mainly (upon which ground at his first sending forth the Disciples, he commanded them to go to these lost sheep, not in the way of the gentiles) so he had the synagogues and Temple to preach in, and frequently did so; and yet notwithstanding went to the fields with great multitudes, and to other places then these appointed for their ordinary and publick Worship; and therefore Presbyterian Ministers may do the like, who are denyed our Conformists Synagogues or ordinary places of Worship, they being upon important grounds obliged

(as our bleſſed Lord was) to officiat and beſtirre themſelves in the exerciſe of their Miniſtry. And therefore. 2. Since he reaſons from the *neceſſity of the Work* which Chriſt was about, and the *oppoſition which he met with therein from his enemies*, theſe ſame grounds pleads ſtrongly for Presbyterian Miniſters officiating in the manner contraverted, becauſe the preaching of the goſpel by Chriſts faithfull Ambaſſadours, was never *more neceſſary*, and never met with *greater oppoſition* from its enemies; and therefore upon *his own grounds* it followes, that Miniſters ought to embrace all occaſions of preaching and in any place where they can have acceſſe. Sure he dare not reſtrict the *neceſſity of the work*, and the *perſecution*, from which he infers the Lawfulneſs of preaching after that manner, to that *particular neceſſity* and perſecution attending the firſt planting of the goſpel, or affirm that theſe grounds may never again recur for legitimating of this practice, ſince thus he would condemn our firſt Reformers.

Come we to the 2d Reaſon which is this, *Chriſt was head of his whole Church, and was not to be limit in the manner of his Miniſtry as ordinary teachers, but might preach where and when he pleaſed, ſince all belonged to his Miniſtry, and that none will ſay that he is paſtor of the whole Church, but the Pope, nor can any meer Man do what Chriſt did in every thing. But our meetings* (he ſayes) *are in deſpite of the Law, and we add diſobedience to our ſchiſm. Ans.* 1. We ſhall eaſily acknowledge that all Chriſts actions are not imitable, ſuch as thoſe of *divine power*, as working of Miracles, and the actions of *divine prerogative*, as the taking of the aſs without the owners liberty, the acting of his ſpecial *Mediatory prerogative*, ſuch as the enditing of the ſcriptures, giving of his ſpirit, laying down his life, inſtituting Church officers, Col. 3. 16. Joh. 10. 15. Mat. 28. 18, 19. Theſe are not imitable

table, nor yet such actions as were meerly *occasional*, depending upon circumstances of time and place, as the unleavened bread, the time, and such like circumstances of his supper. But we say there are actions imitable, as 1. in general Christs exercise of graces, which have constant and moral grounds, and are commended to Christians for their imitation, every christians life (as such) ought to be an imitation of him the precious mirrour of grace, Mat. 11. 29. Learn of me for I am meek. &c. Eph. 5. 2. Walk in love as Christ also hath loved us. Joh. 13. 15. I have given you an example that ye should doe as I have done. The christian must walk as he walked. 1. Joh. 2. 6. 2. In particular, Actions on Moral grounds, flowing from *the relations* wherein Christ stood, do oblige, and are examplary unto, *those that are under such relations*, viz. Christs subjection and obedience to his parents, and paying tribute to cesar, do exemplify children and subjects their duty as in that capacity; so his *Ministerial acts* and faithfull diligence therein, do exemplify Ministers duty. Now the question is, as to this manner of Christs preaching in this case, that is, not in the ordinary and authorized assemblies of that Church but in the fields, and in houses, *whether the grounds of it will not sometimes recur, and oblige ordinary Ministers?* for its *ratio exempli* we are to look unto, rather then the meer circumstances of the Individual act, as Chamier tells us, *Tom. 3. lib. 17. de Jejunijs.* And for evincing this in our case our *Informers* own answer is sufficient, if we shall but suppose (which neither our *Informer* nor any of his fellows have ever been able to disprove) that Prebyterian Ministers are under a relation to this Church as her true Pastors, and under the obligation of our Lords commands to officiat accordingly. His grounds are *the necessity of the work and the bitter persecution of*

*Chriſts enemies*; both which grounds are ſtill vigent in relation to Presbyterian Miniſters as is ſaid.

For what he adds *of Chriſts acting thus as head of his Church, and not limit in the exerciſe of his Miniſtry, as ordinary Miniſters, none of which is an univerſal paſtor.* It is very inſignificant here. For 1. every piece of Chriſts Miniſtry, his very teaching, and teaching in the temple, was as meſſenger of the Covenant, who was to come unto that temple, and in the capacity of head of his Church, yet are examplary for Miniſters duties according to their meaſure. 2. He dare not ſay, that our Lords preaching after the manner inſtanced in the objection of his Doubter, or his preaching while fleeing from perſecutors, was meerly founded upon this ground, and did flow from no other cauſe and principle but this viz. that he was not limited in the way and exerciſe of his Miniſtry, for he hath already aſſigned other Reaſons of this, viz. *the neceſſity of the work, and his perſecution* ſimply conſidered, ſo that if he ſhould aſſert this, his 2. anſwer would contradict his firſt: and beſides, he will not deny, but that ſuch as were not heads of the Church, and who were in an ordinary peacefull ſtate thereof, limited in the exerciſe of their Miniſtry, did preach after this manner, for the officers of the Church of Jeruſalem Acts. 8. in that ſcattering and perſecution, went every where preaching the goſpel. So did our firſt Reformers (not to ſtand upon that moral precept given to the Apoſtles, who were not heads of the Church, viz. when they perſecut you in one city flee to another) and the *Informer* will not ſay that they were not to carry the goſpel-meſſage with them in this flight Now that which thoſe who were not heads of the Church, but Miniſters, yea and ordinary Miniſters have done the parallel of and warrantably, ſurely that Chriſt did not upon any extraordinary ground now expired

pired: But ſuch is this way of preaching, Ergo &c: In a word as its eaſily granted that ordinary Miniſters are fixt and limit to their charges in a ſetled ſtate of the Church, ſo he dare not deny, that a Churches diſturbed perſecute condition will warrand their unfixt officiating upon the grounds already given; and he ſhould know that others then the *Pope* were *univerſal paſtours*, and even in *actu exercito*, of the whole Church, viz. the Apoſtles as himſelf acknowledged, nor can he deny that ordinary Miniſters are in *actu promo* related to the whole Church, as her Miniſters given to her by Chriſt, and *ſet in her*. As for what he adds of our meetings, *that they are againſt the Law*, he knowes that all the Jews appointed that any who owned Chriſt, ſhould be excommunicat. From the violence and perſecution of which Law, himſelf infers our Lords, officiating in the manner contraverted, and he can eaſily make the application to our caſe, and anſwer himſelf.

The Doubter thinks it hard [to be hindred by the Law from hearing the word of God and other parts of worſhip, or that Miniſters be hindered to preach, it being better to obey God then men.] He anſwers 1. *that the Law allowes and commands us to hear the word preacht in our own congregations in purity, and defends it, which is a great mercy, and that its better to worſhip God purely with the Laws allowance then in a way contrary to it. Ans.* 1. Granting that the Law did allow ſome to preach faithfully what ſaith this for their robbing ſo many thouſands of the Lords people, of the Miniſtry of ſome hundreds of faithfull Miniſters? will a piece of the Rulers duty in one point excuſe their ſin in twenty others, and looſe the people from their obligation to duty towards Chriſts Ambaſſadours? This is new divinity. 2. The law allowes none to preach (in the manner he pleads for) but with a blott of per-

jury in taking on the *Prelats mark*, and complying with a perjurious course of defection, and allowes none to deliver their message faithfully in relation to either the sins or duties of the time, which is far from allowing to preach in purity, and in this case we must rather adhere to Christs faithfull shepherds upon his command, tho cross to mens Law, then follow blind unfaithfull guides in obedience thereunto, and this upon that same ground of Acts 4. 19. which he mentions.

But he sayes, *that answer of the Apostles will no way quadrat with our case*, why so? 1. *Because the Apostles had an immediat extraordinary call from Christ to preach in his name, and so were not to be discharged by any power on earth.* *Ans.* 1. That the Apostles answer suites our case, will be apparent when its considered, that our answer and Apology which we offer to our adversaries, who do now accuse and persecute us upon this ground, is one with theirs, their grounds in their answer, compared with the context, are [that they are Christs Ministers and witnesses, employed about the great gospel message, cloathed with his authority, and under the obligation of Christs commands lying upon them.] Now will not this quadrat with our case as to the substance of this answer, dare he say, that the Magistrats Laws can exauctorat a Minister of the gospel, or take away that ministerial authority which he received from Christ, might not thus the ministry be put out of the world? Dare he deny that he is a minister still notwithstanding of the Laws restraint, and standing under a ministerial Relation to the Church, as the Apostles were, and under commands and obligations consequently in order to the exercise of the ministry? can the Rulers meer *prohibition* loose either ministers their relation pastoral, or the obligations flowing therefrom?

2. Altho

2. Altho the call of the Apoſtles was immediat and extraordinary, yet this will not prove that their anſwer will not ſuite the ordinary and mediat call in ſuch a caſe as theirs, when a miniſter is under a legal prohibition to preach: for firſt, we do not find that the Apoſtles did plead their *extraordinary* or *immediat call* mainly or only, if at all in this caſe, but their miniſterial goſpel call and meſſage *qua talis*, the authority of the one, and the weight and importance of the other, in relation to all Miniſters, are conſtant moral grounds bearing the concluſion of the ſame duty and apology as to them: ſince the ſubſtance of this Apoſtolick apology lyes in this, that they were Chriſts Miniſters, cloathed with his commiſſion to preach the goſpel, which any faithfull Miniſter may plead in ſuch a caſe. 2. Tho their call was immediat and extraordinary, upon which ground they were ſingularly out of the reach of the Rulers reſtraint as to their miniſtry, yet they were ſo likewiſe as Chriſts meſſengers and miniſters ſimply in a general ſenſe, for *majus & minus* &c. 3. As the Apoſtles had their power immediatly from Chriſt and not from the Rulers, which is the great ground why they could not be Lawfully prohibit to preach, and would not ſubmit their miniſterial authority, its acts and exerciſe, to the Rulers diſpoſal, eſpecially the goſpel-meſſage being of ſo great importance, ſo there is derived from them a miniſterial authority in the Church, independent in its nature and exerciſe upon the magiſtrat, as theirs was, tho the Apoſtles (as I ſaid) had ſingular prerogatives beyond ordinary miniſters, and in that reſpect were ſingularly beyond the reach of their reſtaint. Now this authority was exerciſed by the Church *renitente Magiſtratu* for ſeveral generations, upon the ſame ground of *this independent ſpiritual power* and the weight

of the gospel-message which the Apostles did here plead;

The *Informer* answers 2ly, *that this prohibition tended to the absolute supressing of the gospel, and there was then no other way for propagating it through the world, but by their preaching, but now tho some be silenced, others are allowed to preach.* Ans. 1. This piece of the apology for not obeying the Rulers mandat, is of his bold putting in, but nothing of it is in the text, viz. *that there were no others to preach the gospel but they.* Their Apology as I said is drawn from their authority, and message simply. 2 I ask him, could any one of the Apostles have submitted to this prohibition, upon an insinuation or assurance that the Magistrat would not hinder others to promote the gospel? if they could not, then he must grant that this anwer is naught, *that the Apostles refused, because the prohibition tended to suppress the gospel*: For the gospel was preacht and propagat, though one of them was a little after taken off the stage, if he say that any one, or more of the Apostles would have submitted to the prohibition upon thir terms, then. 1. He contradicts his first answer, *that their extraordinary immediat call could not be discharged by any power on earth*, and 2. He charges them with unfaithfulness to Christ in laying up his talents, and laying by his work upon mens command not to preach. Sure Christs command and commission tyed all his Apostles conjunctly and severally: Paul said, *wo to* [*me*] *if* [*I*] *preach not the gospel*, and one Apostles diligence, could not loose the obligation of the other, and excuse his negligence. 3. We have proved that there is no warrand from God for Rulers their immediat arbitrary discharging Christs Ambassadours to officiat, and consequently faithfull Ministers are not obliged to obey. And upon the same ground that one apostle could not warrantably suffer the Magistrat to impose a silence upon him, be

cause

cauſe others were permitted to preach, Its unlawfull for ordinary Miniſters to be ſilent, becauſe others are preaching, and much more when thoſe who are preaching are declaring themſelves unfaithfull, and deſtroying but not feeding. So that our *Informer* doth but mock God, if not blaſpheme, while bleſſing him, *that authority, is oppoſit to our diſorders*, not *to the goſpel.*

The Doubter next asks him [if the King and Laws can ſilence a Miniſter that he ſhall not preach the goſpel.] He ſhould have added, by *his own proper elicite acts as King or Magiſtrat, or formally and immediatly.* But this man muſt ſtill ſhrewd himſelf in the miſt and clouds of deceitful generals, and mould our arguments in his own diſguiſe, that his ſimple evaſions may appear anſwers. Well, what ſayes he to this doubt? His anſwer is, (I ommit his inſignificant reflection) *that Solomon thruſt out Abiathar from the prieſthood 1 Kings. 2. 27. which was a reſtraining his prieſtly power as to its actual exerciſe, to which he was bound to ſubmit, ſo a King may diſcharge a Miniſter to exerciſe his Miniſtry within his dominions, which he muſt not counteract, ſuppoſe he think the King and law wrongs him, eſpecially, when others do preach tho he be ſilent. Ans.* This reaſon and inſtance is *a bacu'o ad angulum*, Solomon puniſht Abiathar civilly for a capital treaſonable crime, which deſerved death, telling him (as the text ſaith) that he was a man of death, or one who deſerved capital puniſhment, according to the nature of the hebrew phraſe, which ſentence of death Solomon (upon the grounds mentioned in that paſſage) did change into a ſentence of baniſhment, and by this civil puniſhment did *conſequenter* put him from the exerciſe of his prieſtly office, which he could not in that caſe perform: Ergo he formally and immediatly depoſed him, and the civil magiſtrat may ſo immediatly and formally depoſe miniſters,

ſters, this is a conſequence utterly unknown to all rules of Logick, or ſolid divinity. The Inſtance indeed proves, that the Magiſtrat may civilly puniſh a Miniſter for crimes, and conſequently cut him off from the exerciſe of his Miniſtry, but that he can *ſimply and immediatly, or by proper elicit acts*, diſcharge the exerciſe thereof, can no more be proved from this inſtance, then that the man who gives bad phyſick, or hurts the Miniſters perſon, and *eatenus* ſtops the exerciſe of his Miniſterial office, hath an authority to inhibit the exerciſe of his Miniſtry.

As for our *Informers* reſtriction, anent the Kings inhibiting a miniſter to preach *in his domintons*, 'tis a very poor and tranſparent ſophiſtical cheat, for no man ever ſaid that he can exerciſe any magiſtratical power upon thoſe who are *without his dominions*, whether miniſters or others. And thus ſhould his dominion in Gods providence be ſtreached over all the chriſtian Church, he hath authority (by this court-divinity) to ſilence the goſpel ſound in a clap, and extinguiſh a goſpel miniſtry when he pleaſeth, and then this man would do well to ponder how this conſiſts with the nature and deſigne of Chriſts great commiſſion to his firſt ambaſſadours (his Apoſtles) in reference to the goſpel meſſage, and unto all miniſters untill the end of the world, and his promiſed preſence accordingly; as alſo whether the Apoſtles, and ordinary miniſters afterward, did warrantably counteract the Magiſtrats oppoſition in this exerciſe of their Miniſtry; and what our lords anſwer would have been, in caſe ſuch an objection anent *Princes diſcharging the exerciſe of their Miniſtry*, had been offered by the Apoſtles at the firſt giving out and ſealing of their great patent and commiſſion *to preach to all nations*, and whether our Lord would have told them that their commiſſion did not *bind in that caſe*. The *Informer* is afraid

to

to ſet his foot on ſuch ſlippery ground as to aſſert that the King can *depoſe abſolutely*, but yet averres that he can reſtrain the *actual exerciſe* of the Miniſterial office, and ſurely if this be granted (in that extent he pleads for) it will abundantly ſecure ſelf-ſeeking polititians from the trouble of a faithful Goſpel-Miniſtry, & they will be content to part with this nicety of a ſimple depoſing. But if, in the Judgment even of ſome of his Rabbies, whom I could name, the moſt formal eccleſiaſticall cenſures do amount to no more then this legal reſtraint of the exerciſe, he doth but pityfully reſarciat his lapſe, and mend the matter by this whimſey.

As for what he adds of [ *Beza's* letter to the non-Conformiſts in England, not to exerciſe their Miniſtry againſt the Queens authority and the Biſhops.] The often mentioned difference betwixt the then State of that Church, and our preſent condition, doth quite invalidat his proof, ſince certainly in ſome caſes the counteracting the Princes command as to the exerciſe of the Miniſtry, requires a very cautious conſideration, but had our caſe in its preſent circumſtances and latitude as above delineat been propounded to Beza [ touching the overturning the Reformation of this Church (ſo fully ſetled by civil and Eccleſiaſtick Authority, and confirmed by Oaths of all ranks) by Prelats and their adherents ejecting all faithfull Miniſters, who will not be ſubject to that courſe.] Sure Beza who (as we heard) requeſted John Knox never to let Prelacy be introduced into Scotland, and all faithfull Miniſters to contend againſt it after it was caſt out, would have judged Miniſters obliged in this our caſe, eſpecially after Prelacy is thus vowed againſt, to keep their poſſeſſions, to preach the goſpel, and teſtify againſt ſuch a wicked courſe, as well as it was the duty of our firſt Reformers to preach againſt the

will of the then Bishops and persecuters; Besides, its the Doctrine and principles of our Church, *that neither the Magistrate nor Prelats censures can loose a Minister from the exercise of his Ministry*, which is above cleared. So that our *Informers* great Diana, which he is all this time declaiming for, viz. The imposing of an absolute silence upon the true Pastors of this Church, that Conformists onely may be heard and ownd, doth so stoop and bow down, that the underpropings of his slender artifice, and poor mean pleadings, cannot prevent its precipice and ruine.

## Chap. VI.

*The nature of* Presbyterian *Ministers relation to this* Church *and their call to officiat therin, vindicate from the* Informers *simple cavills. Mr* Baxters *rules for the cure of* Church-*divisions impertinently alledged by him. The Testimonies of the* jus divinum Minist. Anglic. *And of Mr Rutherfoord in his* Due right of Presbytery *anent unwarrantable separation, insufficient to bear the weight of his conclusion.*

THE appearances of our Lords Ambassadours in his message and for promoting his Intereſt, have been much opposed by Satan in very various Methods and versatile disguises in all ages, but that Presbyterian Ministers of a pure Apostolick Presbyterian Church should be opposed in the exercise of their holy function and Ministry received from Christ, and

and this exerciſe impugned from pretended Scripture grounds and Presbyterian principles may ſeem ſtrange, if theſe latter days had not produced many ſuch prodigies of errors and wickedneſs. The progreſs of this perſonat doubt-reſolver his impugnations will diſcover ſo much, which we now proceed to examine.

This *Informer* next alleages *That Miniſters among us make themſelves Miniſters of the whole Church*, and the Doubter alledging [That a Miniſter is a Miniſter of the Catholick Church] he Anſwers from Mr Rutherfoord Due right of Presb. page 204. „That tho a Mi„niſter is a Miniſter of the Catholick Church, yet „not a Catholick Paſtor of it, that by ordination, „and his calling he is made Paſtor and by election he „is reſtricted to be ordinarly the Paſtor of his flock. „And that Mr Durham on Rev. page 106, 107. „thinks there is odds betwixt being a Miniſter of the „Catholick Church, and a Catholick Miniſter of it, „as the Apoſtles were and the Pope pretends viz. to „have immediat acceſs for the exerciſe in all places „— that tho *actu primo* they have a commiſſion to be „Miniſters of the whole Church, yet *actu ſecundo* they „are peculiarly delegated to ſuch and ſuch poſts, But „we have made our ſelves Miniſters of all the congre„gations of the Countrey. I anſwer, this doctrine croſſes not our principles nor practice in the leaſt. For firſt, when we aſſert that a Miniſter is by election reſtricted to be ordinarly the Paſtor of a flock, and eſpecially delegat, and fixt to ſuch a poſt & particular watchtower, it is not ſo to be underſtood, as if there could be no lawful exerciſe of his Miniſtry elſewhere: for firſt, this were flat independency &c. 2. All (ſave they of this perſwaſion) grant that the Miniſter receives no new *authority* as to his Miniſterial acts and officiating in other places, but a new application only. Hence

in

in the 2d place, is to be understood of the Church her ordinary settled state under a settled Ministry but when there is a destroying enemy within her bosome wasting her, and the fathfull Ministry are put from their Watchtowers and posts, by a number of Schismatick Innovators, who are dissolving her union, and impeaching her Authority: In this extraordinary case, Ministers more enlarged and unfixt officiating, is no breach of this Rule; Because 1. In this case the Parochial constitution is impossible to be held, and God calls not to impossibilities, and yet his call to preach the Gospel stands and binds, and by consequence to preach to others then the Ministers parish. The common rule will plead for this viz. *necessitas non habet legem*, which this *Informer* himself doth hold will in some cases warrand the laying by of that which otherwise were a duty; he knows what his inference is from Davids eating of the shew bread to keep from starving, and Paul, and those with him their casting their goods into the sea to preserve from perishing. So that of necessity he must admit this rule and answer, upon his own ground. 2. The reasons which did warrand our first Reformers officiating in this manner (a practice which he dare not say that the authors mentioned, or any reformed divines do condemn) will warrand this our practice in this persecute state of our Church, it being clear that the case of Reformation is parallel to that of a Churches defection, and persecution, in relation to this practice contraverted, as we cleard from Acts 8. 3. The same great end of the Churches *greater good and edificaton*, which warrands fixing of Ministers to their posts in a Churches setled peacefull state will warrand their officiating more largely and at other posts, when put from their own in her disturbed, persecute and destroyed coondition by a prevalent Schismatick, backsliding

ſliding party. The faithfull watchmen ſeing the city betrayed by a party of profeſſed defendents, who are letting in the enemy, do their duty to the city beſt in reſiſting them and running to help. 4. If faithfull Miniſters their neceſſary keeping their poſts and the unlawfulneſs of exerciſing their Miniſtry any where elſe, were in this caſe aſſerted, then it would follow that a Miniſter ſtanding in that relation to a diſturbed and deſtroyed Church, and all his gifts and graces, were *uſeleſs in that caſe*, which notwithſtanding are given for *the good of the Church*, but this is abſurd; Shall not the weeping Church be taken by the hand by her true Sons, when ſhe is wounded and her vail taken away by ſmiting watchmen. 5. By our Principles the Prelatick party are Schiſmaticks who have already broke and overturned our Churches order, and Reformation. Now this *Informer* will not deny, that in ſiich a caſe, the Church may ſend forth her Miniſters to officiat among ſuch backſliders and Schiſmaticks, for their healing and recovery; he knowes upon what ground Mr *Lightoun* not long ſince, ſent out ſome of his brethren to preach in the Weſt of Scotland. Beſide Mr *Gilleſpie* will tell him, *Miſcell. page* 23. *That a Schiſmatick Church hath no juſt right to the liberty of a ſound Church, as to the calling or ſetling of Miniſters.* So that in our principles no Conformiſts are duely or lawfully called and ſettled. 6. Our divines do grant that in extraordinary caſes, even *the want of ordination it ſelf* will not hinder to officiat Miniſterially but that there may be a neceſſity which will ſuſtain and comport with the want of it. Mr *Gilleſpy Miſc. ch.* 4. *page* 63. tells us, „ that in extraordinary caſes „ when ordination cannot be had, and when there are „ none who have commiſſion & authority from God to „ ordain, then and there an inward call from God ſtirr- „ ing up, and aſſiſting with the people's good will and

„ conſent whom God makes willing, can make a Mini-
„ ſter authorized to miniſterial acts —— That at the
„ firſt plantation of Churches, ordination may be
„ wanting without making void the Miniſtry becauſe
„ ordination cannot be had. And if neceſſity will plead this in relation to ordination it ſelf, *Ergo a fortiori* this neceſſity of our Churches deſtroyed perturbed condition, may much more comport with ordained Miniſters their more enlarged officiating for the help and recovery of a periſhing remnant, by Wolves in ſheeps cloathing.

Next, this *Informer* going on in his nauſeating repetitions, charges *intruſion* upon our Miniſters, and enquires, *what warrand they have to preach and adminiſter Sacraments to thoſe of another Miniſters charge, being neither called nor deſired by theſe Minsſters.* I anſwer, they have Gods call to preach the Goſpel as Minſters of this Church, and as this call would warrand their officiating in other pariſhes upon the lawfull Miniſters deſire or invitation in a ſettled ſerene ſtate of our Church, ſo in this her ruined and deſtroyed condition, the ſame call abundantly warrands their helping of theſe congregations, and ſuch poor Macedonians, who deſire their help while under deſtroying Schiſmaticks, who have no lawfull call to be their Miniſters from God or this Church.

But here our *Informer* aſſaults us with a *dilemma*; *either Presbyttrian Miniſters call is ordinary, or extraordinary. Ordinary they have none, ſince they are not invited by the Miniſters of the congregations to whom they preach, extraordinary they will not pretend unto.* I Anſwer by a *counterdilemma*, and retort his argument thus, either the pretended Miniſters of theſe congregations have an ordinary or extraordinary call to officiat therein, ordinary they have none according to the Doctrine, Reformation, and principles of this Church, being neither

neither called by the people, nor ordained by the Presbyteries of this Church, if we ſpeak of the generality who are ordained and obtruded by the Prelats, upon theſe congregations where they officiat, and for thoſe who were otherwiſe ordained and have conformed, we have told him that by accepting preſentation from Patrons and collation from Prelats, they have renounced their Presbyterian call and ordination and the call of this Church conſequently, and thus do fall under the ſame conſideration with the reſt; and for the exraordinary call neither the one nor the other, will pretend unto it. And when he anſwers this *dilemma*, and by the Scripture-rules, and the Principles, and reformation of this Church, (which the *Informer* hath not diſproved, yea admits us to ſuppoſe in this queſtion) juſtifies the Curats call to officiat in theſe congregations over which they aſſume an authority we ſhall produce ours as to this practice which he condemns. Beſide, what anſwer will he give to ſuch a *dilemma* in the mouth of Schiſmatick congregations, offered unto ſuch Miniſters as the Church ſends from their own congregations to officiat among them? And whatever his anſwer be, it will ſuite our caſe. Then he tells us *of acts of councils condemning this encroachment*, as he calls it, But when he ſhall exhibit a caſe parallel to ours, which theſe acts ſpeak unto, we ſhall conſider it. For what he adds of the „ Aberdeen Doctors their charging the Pres„byterian Miniſters who preacht in their congrega„tions, with a practice repugnant to the Scripture „and Canons of ancient Councils, he ſhould have done well to have produced theſe Scriptures which the Doctors alleaged: And for ancient Canons, I think all things in their caſe conſidered, it would be a hard task to produce theſe Canons ſtricking againſt that practice as it ſtood circumſtantiat, conſidering their

Schiſmatick withſtanding the Reformation of this Church, their Arminian principles, and defending popiſh ceremonies which errors they had openly vented and obſtinatly maintaind.

His next charge *of ordaining others to perpetuat our ſchiſm*, is a manifeſt calumny, this true organick Church is by this practice, only propagating a lawfull pure Miniſtry in oppoſition to their deſtroying Schiſmatick courſe, the bleſſed fruits whereof, and its ſeals upon the hearts of the people of God, have been conſpicuous, and we hope yet further will. And no leſs groſs is that calumny which follows, *anent our great mixt communions, and admiſſion of ignorant vitious perſons unto them, who* (he ſayes) *by our way cannot be kept back*, there being none admitted at any ſeaſons of this nature (which have been very rare) but upon ſufficient teſtimonies from faithfull Miniſters or elderſhips. But is he not aſhamed to object this to us, whereof his party is ſo notoriouſly guilty, who are knowen to admit, yea call promiſcuouſly, to fill their empty tables, (which tender ſouls dare not approach unto) both groſs ignorants, and notoriouſly profane to the ſhame and ſcandal of Religion, and the contempt of that holy ordinance; our perſuading people not to owne Conformiſts as the Miniſters of this Church we hope doth now appear better grounded then all this *Informers* perſuaſives to the contrary. And that we have been in any meaſure ſucceſſull in this, ſpeaks out Gods purpoſe not to leave wholly our married land.

For that which he cites out of *Baxters* preface to the *Cure of Church diviſions* anent *the odiouſneſs of Sacrifices preſented to God, without love and reconciliation to brethren, and of making a peoples communion in worſhip, the badge and means of unchartablneſs and diviſions*, we think reconciliation and unionin the Lord needfull to acceptable

table worſhip, but an aſſociation with ſcandalous Schiſmaticks and backſliders in their wickedneſs, we think is no leſs dangerous and obſtructive to reall fellowſhip with God in duty; eſpecially ſince God preſſes our coming out from among ſuch, and our being ſeparat from the contagion of their ſin, with this motive, *that he will receive us.* And as there is a *holy brotherhood* which we muſt aſſociat with in order to communion with God, ſo there is a *congregation of evill doers* which we muſt hate. Yea we have Davids precedency (as is before obſerved) to hate them with perfect hatred, and count them our enemies. But who can ſufficiently admire theſe mens talk of *unity and love* who having firſt broken and divided this poor Church have been theſe ſo many years perſecuting to the death, yea ſweeming in the blood of the faithfull Miniſters and profeſſors therof becauſe hey durſt not joyn to their way, and conform to their ſuppoſed trifles and indifferencies. Surely prelacy being the grand Idol of Jealouſy provoking God againſt us, and the fire which hath kindled all our combuſtions, and hath opened the veins of the Lords ſervants and people to bleed for many years, occaſioned ſuch horrid diſperſion and unheard of oppreſſion of the Lords Church and people in our Land, with what faces can theſe upholders of this courſe look up to the God of Love and peace, and how can they lift up ſuch bloody wrathfull hands to him.

But now his poor half proſelyted Doubter confeſſes that [there is much truth in what he has heard from this ſound *Informer forſooth* ——— And takes leave with a profeſt reſolution to reflect upon what he has heard from him,] Whereupon he diſmiſſes him with ſome of his healing advices, prefacing with an admonition to ſeek *illumination from God.* But had this man been ſerious in ſeeking this from God, he had not vented in

theſe trifling Dialogues ſuch weak notions and reproaches againſt Gods truth and people. But ſince his Doubter returns him no anſwer therunto, I ſhall make up his want and ſhortly offer my thoughts upon them. His firſt advice, is *not to be too confident of our own opinion as undoubtedly right, but conſider what he hath ſaid in his three conferences. Ans.* If it be truth which we hold, ſure we moſt hold it *by faith in a pure conſcience*, and not be *wavering and toſſed children.* We acknowledge not the Carteſian principle, and the popiſh doubting way as found divinity, and a confidence of truth is far from a *ſelf confidence.* As for what is offered in his three dialogues, I hope it is ſufficiently antidoted by what is ſaid above, ſo that it needs not in the leaſt demurr our perſuaſion.

2. *He will not have us think the matters of difference to be the ſubſtantialls of Relegion, ſince perſons of both perſuaſions may keep love and fellowſhip without renting the Church and neglecting ordinances, becauſe greater differences have been, and communion not broken thereby. Ans.* If theſe matters contraverted be not ſubſtantialls, why then have they made ſuch a ſubſtantiall bloody conteſt for them *ſanquam pro aris & focis*, for ſo many years, and if communion muſt not be broken in a Church upon this account, why have they rent and overturned our Church, and perſecute away ſo many godly Miniſters and profeſſors for theſe things, denying all fellowſhip with them in their worſhip, for adhering to their principles, and diſowning this courſe of conformity? had prelatiſts ſuffered Presbyterian Miniſters and profeſſors to ſtand as they were in this Church, to enjoy their principles, and to follow their reſpective duties according to their ſtations, faithfull Miniſters to preach, and Gods people to enjoy the fruits of their Miniſtry, he might with ſome colour have pretended to this deſire of union and fellowſhip, but ſince prelatiſts

latiſts have caſt them out, and do ſo cruelly perſecute them for adhering to their principles, and owning theſe duties, this pretence is nothing but deceitfull hypocriſy. He adds, *that the difference is but a matter of government, and if we ſeparat for this, we would have ſeparat from all Churches ſince chriſtianity began. and if Chriſt held no comunion with a Church, where prelacy was, he hath then ſeldom had a Church, and hath been for many years a head without members. Ans.* This is nothing but a renewed repetition of groundleſs aſſertions: for how proves he that our plea is a *matter of government only*? ſurely their courſe ſtrikes at the whole of our Reformation, as hath been cleared. Again, how proves he that we would have ſeparat upon this ground from the Church for ſo long a time, tho it were granted that our plea were only a matter of government, ſince he hath not yet produced inſtances of ſuch a prelacy as we have, in any Church. Beſides, ſince the *Informer* pleads for prelacy upon pretended Apoſtolical precepts and practices, and yet doth here vilify it unto a meer punctilio, and makes it ſuch a ſorry buſineſs as perſons may come and go upon it at their pleaſure, we may eaſily diſcover what nimble Sophiſters, and ſlippery fingered Gentlemen he and his fellows are as to the retaining and holding of divine inſtitutions, and that they can eaſily expoſe them to ſale, for obtaining eaſefull ſerenity and other worldly deſigns. Or how proves he that its the *government of our Church* which they have introduced? or that they are *the Church*? or that we are in this practice *ſeparating from our Church*? Hath not Chriſt a myſtical body in Scotland without prelats? or finally, how proves he that there is alike ground for Joyning to prelacy, introduced by an Apoſtat party, after it is caſt out, and abjured by all, as there is for Joyning in fellowſhip with a Church continuing Long under that corruption, and not purged

ged and reformed from it. The Joyning with them in their worſhip, being demanded as a badge of our conſent to prelacy it ſelf and all the corruptions attending the ſame.

3. *He pleads for charity, and that we ſay not Conformiſts are graceleſs becauſe of this difference*, he tells us, *that for all Corinths corruptions, the Apoſtle ſpends a whole chapter upon* Love, *and that ſuch as have leaſt truth, have leaſt charity, that the weak chriſtians who underſtood not their liberty Rom. 14. in being looſed from the ceremonial* Law, *had leaſt charity as they had leaſt truth, and ſo papiſts to proteſtants. Ans.* This charge lyes moſt directly home to himſelf, and thoſe of his way. Let more then 20. years Law & practice, in relation to the ruine of a faithfull remnant of Miniſters and profeſſors who adhere to the reformation and government of this Church, and their vows for promoting the ſame, diſcover what hath been the charity of our Prelatical party. Beſide, whatever be our thoughts as to their ſtate with God, and without judging their eternal condition, its no breach of charity to know ſuch as are ſeducers from Gods way, to beware of ſin, and the enſnarings of ſuch ſeducers, for which we have ſo many ſcripture commands as we have heard, and the Judgment of diſcretion in relation to evils which we are to eſhew, is not that uncharitable judging in matters Lawfull and Indifferent, which is condemned, Rom. 14. 3, 4. for elſe we could not act in faith. And the ſame Corinthians whom Paul exhorted ſo much to Love, he enjoyned alſo to come out from among the ungodly 2 Cor. 6. and to flee the contagion of their ſin.

4. He adviſes *to conſider the danger of diviſions* Gal. 5. 15. Mark 3. 24. *ſince the enemy mocks religion upon this ground, and while each fights with another, all are overcome, which* he illuſtrats with *the ſtory of* Scilurus his ſheaf

ſheaf of arrowes Anſ. Diviſions indeed among Gods people are ſad, and have had ſad effects, but union muſt be in *truth and duty*, and cemented with theſe bonds, ſince it is the *unity of the ſpirit* which we muſt ſeek Eph 4.3. and therefore not in a way of defection and Rebellion againſt God and in breaking his Covenant, which is nothing elſe but a combination againſt him; It is in *the Lord*, that we muſt be of the *ſame mind*, Phil. 4 2. and Chriſt who prayed ſo enixly, for his diſciples union, Joh. 17. 21. prayed alſo for their *ſanctification in and by the truth*, 17. ver. and that they might be *kept from the evill of the world*, 15. ver. And the Apoſtle Paul who is ſo great a pleader for Love and union, *would not give place by ſubjection* to deceitfull workers, *no not for an hour* Gal. 2. 5. The beſt way to maintain union & preſerve the Goſpel (which their dividing innovating courſe of backſliding hath expoſed to ſo much prevalency and reproach of Papiſts) is to keep our garments free of their defilements, & to put away that *accurſed thing* which hath made us ſo weak before enemies.

5. He adviſes his Doubter to acquaint himſelf with the writings of the old Non conformiſts in England, ſuch as *Cartwright*, *Bradſhaw*, *Ball*, &c. Who teſtify againſt the Browniſts for their ſeparation from that Church (for which he ſayes much more might have been alledged then for ours.) *Anſ.* We acknowledge that theſe worthy men have done well upon this ſubject, and that ſeparation which they wrote againſt; But our caſe [anent a Church purely reformed from corruptions of doctrine, worſhip, diſcipline and Government and under univerſal oaths of adherence to that reformation infeſted, encroached upon, and invaded by a party of Schiſmatick overturners of her reformation, ſtanding in oppoſition to a faithful Miniſtry, and profeſſors adhering to them,] is ſo vaſtly diſcrepant from their caſe, [anent keeping up fellowſhip with a Church univerſal-

ly tainted with corruptions, from which ſhe had never been purged,] that by no imaginable grounds, can a conſequence be drawen from the one to the other. And any conſequence relating to us, or application of the pleadings of theſe Divines againſt the Browniſts, will properly ſtrike againſt his dividing party, who have gone out from the fellowſhip of this pure Church, to which they were Joyned, and did vow adherence to her conſtitution and reformation, yet notwithſtanſting by them thus miſerably rent and deſtroyed for many years.

As for theſe Rules of Mr *Baxter* in his *Cure of Church diviſions*, which this *Informer* doth afterward commend unto us, we are not much concerned in their explication or application, ſince they do not in the leaſt ſtrike againſt what we maintain, therefore we ſhall briefly run over them. For the firſt here mentioned, [anent not making communion with a Church ſtricter then Chriſt hath made it] when we diſowne dividers and Schiſmaticks renting and deſtroying a pure Church, and introducing abjured innovations, we do not narrow theſe terms of communion, which Chriſt hath given. For he hath commanded us to withdraw from *ſuch as cauſe diviſions and offences*, contrary to our received ordinances, and not to have fellowſhip wirh the unfruitfull works of darkneſs, to turn away from Covenant-breakers; And its their dividing party who fall under the cenſure of this rule, who make complyance with abjured prelacy the terms of their commnnion, and ſo cruelly perſecute all who will not conform to their courſe of backſliding. There is no doubt equal danger on the other extreme in making the terms of our communion *laxer* then Chriſt hath appointed. For the 2 rule which he mentions [anent a due impreſſion of the evill of diviſion and diſcord, and the reaſons and neceſſity

ceſſity of union.] I think indeed had this *Informer* and his party, kept up a Scripture impreſſion of this, they had not for the *punctilio's* of their trifling Conformity, ſo miſerably rent this poor Church, and overturn'd her Reformation. For the 3. [anent not engadging too far in a divided ſect,] it reaches Conformiſts, another blow, who have ſo far engadged for Prelats and their Intereſt, that for many years it hath been the great work of our Laws (by the inſtigation of them, and their Rabbies) to root out all Miniſters and profeſſors of this Church, who do not conform, and owne this courſe of backſliding. Dare this petulant *Informer* call adherence to this Church, her ſworn Reformation, principles, and faithfull Miniſtry, *adherence to a divided Sect.* For the 4. [anent the difference betwixt a ſound and ſinfull zeal, and that we be ſuſpicious of our Religious paſſions] we ſay, zeal for the Goſpel, for keeping Covenant with God, for reformation from popry and prelacy (which is the the Teſt of our zeal as ſtated in oppoſition to them) doth convincingly evidence its ſoundneſs. For the 5. [anent not being over tender of our repute, or impatient of mens cenſures,] we ſay, to be tender of truth and duty, and our good name in maintaining it, which is as precious ointment, and to be tender of not offending and diſpleaſing all who are thus tender, is nothing but a true and Goſpel-tenderneſs. For the 6. [anent eſhewing needleſs fellowſhip with the more cenſorious Chriſtians] we ſay, we ſtand oblig'd to keep fellowſhip with all the godly in all duties, and this charge of *over cenſoriouſneſs*, we deny as to our plea againſt Conformiſts, neither hath he *Informer* yet made it good. For the 7. [that we lay not too much weight on doubtfull opinions, nor begin with them] we bleſs God that in this pure Church, Gods people have been taught the *ſolid beginnings and firſt principles*, and

and do build on that foundation; But we have not ſo learned Chriſt, as to put into the Category of *things doubtfull, breach of Covenant, abjur'd Prelacy*, and a *Schiſmatick ſinfull complyance therewith*. For the 8. [anent not admiring or favouring a preacher for his voice, affectionat utterance, &c. Without ſolid underſtanding,] we ſay, Gods people with us have been helped not to regard mens ſpeech, but their power. And as they know Chriſt the great ſhepherd his truth, by his voice from them, accordingly as his ſheep to follow them. For the 9. [anent not rejecting a good cauſe, becauſe owned by bad men] we ſay, the cauſe we diſowne is bad in it ſelf, and we diſowne the owners of this bad cauſe, upon this ground; And are confirmed in our diſowning of it, by the fruits which we ſee the owning of it produceth in its ſupporters and abbetors, which are ſuch as do warrand us according to our Lords command, to *avoid and beware of them*. For the 10. [not to follow the bad examples of Religious perſons,] we bleſs the Lord we are taught to walk by the rule of Gods Word, not by examples of men, and not to follow even a Paul further then he is a follower of Chriſt. For the 11. [anent keeping an eye on the ſtate of all Churches upon earth, and pondering how Chriſt keeps fellowſhip with them, leſt while we think we ſeparat only from theſe about us, we ſeparat from almoſt all Churches] we ſay, that we have lookt upon our own Church deſervedly, as among the pureſt and beſt reformed, and by the ſame rule are concerned to keep up fellowſhip with her, as knowing that ſuch as renounce fellowſhip with her, would renounce it with all Churches. And this we do with a due charity for all Reformed Churches, and whatever Churches do hold the foundation. But upon theſe grounds we are bound to diſowne *deſtroying Schiſmaticks*, as are our Conformiſts,

formiſts, who have introduced abjured innovations contrary to her pure conſtitution and Reformation, and have gone out from her fellowſhip, and by the ſame conſequential reaſon, from the fellowſhip of all Churches. For the laſt rule which he mentions, [that we count it as comfortable to be a martyr for love and peace by blind zealots, as for the faith by infidels] we ſay, that we owne no zeal which is not according to knowledge, and are contending for the union and reformation of our Mother againſt a party of blind fiery zelots, for ane abjured hierarchy contrary to the Word of God and this Churches vows, in which honourable quarrel that many have ſuffered even to bonds, impriſonments, yea death it ſelf, it is our Glory. As for what he adds [of the Engliſh nonconformiſts, *their teſtyfing againſt ſeparation as a way which God never bleſſed with peace and holineſs though they diſſented from the Ceremonies*] I nothing doubt, but that they would have put the ſame Character upon the practice of the Prelats and their followers, had they ſeen and known all the circumſtances of our caſe. They diſſenting from fellowſhip in the ceremonies, and *eatenus* from fellowſhip in the Worſhip, though that Church, had never been purged from them, how much more then are we concerned to diſowne innovations introduced into this Church, after they have been caſt out and vowed againſt. Suppoſe that Church, had been (as ours) Reformed in doctrine Worſhip, diſcipline and Government, and a party had riſen up deſtroying that pure conſtitution, contrary to all their vows, admitting none to fellowſhip without acknowledging of their wicked courſe, perſecuting and caſting out all Miniſters and profeſſors, who would not concur? And then let them tell us what theſe nonconformiſts would have done in this caſe, ſurely upon the ſame ground that they

eſhewed

eſhewed a contagion in communicating with the Ceremonies, they would have eſhewed this piece of contagious conformity alſo. Eſpecially the expreſs vows of adherence to that ſuppoſed reformation in every piece of it, and of diſowning all receſſes, all backſliders, and of owning all adherers to theſe vows in proſuing the ends thereof, being taken in, and duely pondered.

After the cloſe of this Dialogue, our *Informer* will needs ſtrengthen his plea in preſenting unto us, by way of Apendix, ſome paſſages of the Engliſh Preſbyterians, their *Jus divinum Miniſterij Anglicani*, and likewiſe in Mr Rutherfoord his *due right of Presbytery*, anent the *unwarrantableneſs of Separation*, which as they are utterly alien from our purpoſe, ſo (as would ſeem in the conviction hereof) he doth not ſo much as offer to draw an argument from any of them, while propounding theſe his grand ſuppoſed topicks, except a general hint at the cloſe, which is utterly inſufficient to fortify his concluſion, as we ſhall after ſhew, but leaves the favourable concluſion to be drawn by his half-proſelyted Doubter, or friendly partial reader. However (altho upon the matter any ſeeming concluſion he might draw from them is anſwered, yet) we ſhall view them breifly, having premiſed (1.) That he ſuppoſes but hath not yet made good, the charge of a *ſinfull ſeparation* upon the people of God in this caſe, which we have ſhown to be more applicable to himſelf. 2. That the caſe of ſeparation from *that Church at that time* becauſe of her corruptions, is far wide from this caſe of our diſowning Conformiſts now, and conſequently all his citations will never come home to our purpoſe, becauſe.

1. Not to ſeparat from a Church upon the ground of corruptions which have been long ſetled in her, is very far diſtinct from this practice of diſowning an Inno-

Innovating party introducing corruptions to the ruine of a pure Church, after they have been ſeen, and univerſally caſt out, which is the practice he now pleads for; a ſtop as to an advance in Reformation, is much different from backſliding in this caſe, and eſpecially the joyning to a backſliding party who are not the true Church, is much different from adherence to a Church tho backſlidden. Its a far different caſe not to leave the communion of a Church becauſe of ſome corruptions, and not to joyn with an unſound party of a Church drawing back from her Reformation: So that upon a due conſideration of the matter of fact, and Presbyterian principles, its evident that theſe Teſtimonies do levell againſt Conformiſts.

2. Its a far different caſe to owne the Miniſtry of a corrupt Church wherin prelacy is univerſally owned, and wherein there hath been no other way of entry into the Miniſtry for many generations but by Prelacy: and to owne a party of Schiſmatick Intruders introducing Prelacy over the belly of a Presbyterian Church, and ſhutting out her faithfull Miniſtry, ſurely theſe Intruders are in this caſe the Browniſts.

3. Its a far different caſe to ſubmit to a Miniſtry *meerly Epiſcopal*, and to keep the Worſhip in a Church *long under this Government*, and to ſubmit to an *Epiſcopal Eraſtian Miniſtry*, and a Church Government *fundamentally corrupt*, deriving all its power from an Antichriſtian ſupremacy, and meer civil papacy, after it hath been eminently and univerſally diſowned by that Church, and vowed againſt, Eſpecially when a backſliding party only do thus uſurp over the ſound Miniſtry, and have ejected them, and this Eraſtian abomination is ſet up to raze this true ſpiritual Govern-

vernment of the Church once univerſally ſetled and owned.

4. Its a far different caſe, to ſubmit to an Epiſcopal Miniſtry ſo far as pure, while Epiſcopacy is univerſally ownd, and no obligation is upon any to diſowne it, further then its own corruption in that caſe will amount to and infer: and to owne and ſubmit to an *epiſcopal Eraſtian Government* introduced by an Innovating party into a Presbyterian Church againſt *her ſtanding acts, ſolemn Oaths and vows univerſally taken on by that Church againſt the ſame*, while a faithfull Miniſtry, and the great part of the people are in Conſcience of their vows contending againſt it. Surely this ſuperinduced obligation requires a higher degree of zeal againſt that defection, and renders it the more hainous. The high places permitted to David and Solomon before the Temple was built, are cenſured in after times; greater light and obligations do in this caſe caſt the ballance.

Theſe conſiderations do clearly repell any argument which he would draw from his citations to our caſe. But now to view them, The Engliſh Presbyterians in that piece do firſt aſſert page 10. [ that all in the ſame bounds moſt be under the care of the ſame Miniſter, and that theſe limits ought not to be brangled *Anſ.* This ſhall be eaſily accorded, give us our beautifull Church-order and a lawfully called Miniſtry and this parochial order ſhall be obſerved, and obeyed.

2. (page 11.) [A man under a wicked or Heretical Miniſter muſt remove his habitation rather then brangle parochial order.] *Anſ* Then it follows in their principles, that when the order and union of a Reformed Church is already brangled by Innovating Schiſmaticks, whoſe wickedneſs and errors are palpable, men may attend a more pure Miniſtry without

out Schiſm, by clear conſequence, ſure he is a loſer by this.

3. (page 12.) [to appoint Elders in *every Church and every city*, is all one, and converts in the city muſt joyn with the congregation in Churchfellowſhip.] *Anſ.* But what if a party in the city call themſelves the Church, ſhut out the true Miniſter, and bring in one of their own, muſt not the true converts own their firſt Miniſter, and oppoſe theſe Innovators? Surely this Teſtimony rebounds another blow upon our *mis Informer.*

4. (page 25.) [evil men *de facto* have been officers, Hophni and Phineas, Scribes and Phariſees, whoſe Miniſterial acts were not null, and Chriſts commiſſion authorized Judas.] *Anſ.* This will as much plead for owning Presbyterian Miniſters as Conformiſts: And if he alleadge that they are diſorderly, Schiſmatical, &c. and therefore muſt not be ownd in this caſe. I anſwer 1 he muſt prove this which he hath not yet done. 2. He muſt acknowledge, that the granting that the Miniſterial acts of Church-officers, are not null by their ſins, will not plead for hearing Miniſters in every caſe, untill *aliunde*, and *from other grounds*, our obligation to owne ſuch men as our *Miniſters hic & nunc* be made good, which he hath not yet done as to Curats. Neither Hophni or Phineas, nor the Scribes and Phariſees, were rooting out the faithfull Miniſtry of the Church of the Jews, who would not concurr in a courſe of defection, after they had laid down a courſe to overturn the ordinances: which is the caſe of Conformiſts in relation to us, as is evident. Again, ſtate the queſtion ſo that Hophni and Phineas, and the Phariſees Miniſtry could not be owned without partaking in their ſin, then this man muſt needs grant, that Gods people were obliged to diſowne them, and had diſowned them. Now we have proven this to be our caſe as to the owning of Conformiſts.

5. (page 42, 43.) [Iſrael is called the people of the Lord, even after the Calves were ſet up at Dan and Bethel, and Cajaphas was own'd as high prieſt, though they came to the office by bribry and faction, and the highprieſt had an hand in crucifying Chriſt.] *Anſ.* The ſame reply and retortion recurs as formerly, what will he ſay if we plead this for presbyterian Miniſters, whom he will not call worſe then theſe mentioned, nor will he ſay that our Presbyterian Church is worſe then that Church. So that he muſt grant this will not reach his concluſion, till more be ſuppoſed and proved in this point. Again, tho God in his ſoveraign diſpenſation had not as yet caſt off the ten tribes, having a faithfull remnant among them, yet I hope he will not from this plead for owning the Calves, or the Prieſts Miniſtry whom Jeroboam had obtruded, and ſet up contrary to Gods inſtitution, and for keeping up that wofull breach in Gods worſhip, and in Iſrael, which was therby promoted, and this is a fit emblem of their Innovating prelatick Miniſtry. Beſide that the high prieſts were men in a conſiderable meaſure deciders and Interpreters of the civil Law, and might in that reſpect be owned. But however, it is (as we have ſaid) bad arguing from the comporting with corruptions in that old diſpenſation and Miniſtry eſpecially when drawing near an end, to the receiving of abjured corruptions into a Church which has been rid of them, and from a *non-ſeparating* in the firſt caſe, to conclude againſt a *non-union* or non complyance in the ſecond. And thus neither will Pauls carriage toward the high priſt, Acts 23. plead for adhering to Curats upon the ſame grounds. For he will not ſay that Paul underſtood not his office in a ſpiritual ſenſe to be now expired, and that he was not to be owned as a teacher, who was every way deſtitute of the truth of the goſpel, and an enemy unto it.

Jackſon

Jackſon thinks with ſevral others, „ that Paul ſaid, *I knew not that he was the high prieſt* &c. ironically, it „ being very improbable, that Paul knew not the „ high prieſt, and ſuppoſe it were ſo, he knew him to „ be a ruler as his own words diſcover, ſo that it was „ no excuſe to ſay he knew not the high prieſt, becauſe „ as a judge it was againſt the law to revile him. Ther- „ fore (ſaith Jackſon upon Exod. 22. 28.) though „ they underſtood Paul as excuſing himſelf, yet he „ ſpoke by way of deriſion as diſdaining he ſhould be accounted Gods high-prieſt, who carryed ſo. Which „ (ſaith he) is the more probable, when its conſide- „ red how far he was from having any true right to „ that place and power to which he pretended, when „ Chriſt had aboliſhed the legal prieſt hood. Calvine on that place of the Acts ſayes, Its not credible that Paul gave him his wonted honour. —— *Cum abolita eſſet adventu Chriſti ſacerdotij Majeſtas, & ſecuta turpis prophanatio, Paulum quaſi integra vigeret, ſolito honore proſecutum fuiſſe, qui tunc ſub Pontificum titulo nullo jure dominabantur*, „ after the majeſty of the prieſt hood was „ aboliſhed by the coming of Chriſt, and vile pro- „ phanity attending it, that Paul, as if the prieſt- „ hood had been ſtanding intire, would have allo- „ wed the wonted honour to ſuch who under the title „ of Prieſts were governing without any right or juſt title. And having objected to himſelf, that we muſt not contemn civill Magiſtrats, in his anſwer he puts a difference betwixt civil Mahiſtrats and Church rulers — *Inter civiles Magiſtratus* (ſaith he) *& eccleſiæ præſules aliquid eſt diſcrimenus* ——„ there is a difference betwixt „ civill Magiſtrats and Church officers, tho the ad- miniſtration of civil Rulers be perverſe and confuſed yet (he tells us) the Lord will have ſubjection remain intire. —— *Sed ubi ſpirituale regimen degenerat ſolvuntur piorum conſcientiæ, ne injuſtæ dominationi pareant &c.* ſpiri-

„tuall government being degenerat, the conſciences of „ the faithfull are looſed from obedience to an unjuſt „ domination. But our *Informer* will ſay, that I thus ſet the authors of *jus divinum miniſt. anglic.* by the ears with *Calvin* and *Jackſon* as to the ſenſe of this place. I anſwer, they do not peremptorly and poſitively aſſert that Paul acknowledged him as high prieſt, but onely, *that many think he did.* 2. Hence the weight of their concluſion ſubjoyned, viz. that *corruptions cleaving to Gods ordinances null them not*, is not laid upon this ſolely, nor *poſitivly* at all, even as a partial, but onely as a *probable ground.* And the concluſion it ſelf when admitted, will never reach his deſigne as is above cleared. Again, admitting that Paul acknowledged his providential title, or *jus in re* as to a civil office and adminiſtration at that time, as it may well have its own weight in reference to the premiſed concluſion, civil rule, as ſuch, being Gods ordinance, which is not made null by corruptions, ſo upon the the difference of civil from ſacred rule this conceſſion will not legitimat or infer an acknowledgment of the ſpiritual part of his adminiſtration.

Thus we have ſeen how well our *Informer* hath acquit himſelf in his arguing from the Engliſh Presbyterians. Let us next conſider, how he reaſons from Mr Rutherfoord in that peice forecited, if at leaſt we may call that which he here offers a formal reaſoning, ſince he offers not (as I ſaid) any argument from theſe citations, but ſure we will find that theſe paſſages will burn his fingers. In that piece [ſcil. Due right of presb. page 220. to 256.] There are ſeveral paſſages which this man takes hold of, as 1. [He aſſerts that ſeparation from a true Church where the orthodox word is preached, and ſacraments duely adminiſtrat, is unlawfull, and vindicats 2 Cor. 6.] *Ans.* This in Mr Rutherfoords ſenſe will plead more for the Presbyterian Miniſtry & dro-

professors then for Conformists, whom he will not say that Mr Rutherfoord will look upon *as our Church*, in such a case as this, since (as we heard) he holds that in case of such a breach as we have now, the pure Church remains with the smaller stedfast number, and that the backsliders from truth and purity, tho the greater number, yet really are the Schismaticks. And in this sense we are to understand him when he sayes that this separation as to worship, will not infer an absolut separation, And his allowing *non-union*, where there is not sufficient cause of *separation*, in the case of purer to be joyned with, and his admitting a *partial separation*, because of a *partial corruption* of ordinances (*Peacable plea page* 121.) will much more plead for a *total non-union* in this our case; and I dare appeal this *Informer* if Mr Rutherfoords words (*Peaceable plea page* 122.) doth not suite our case and express such a sense therof as we have explaind; and if he would not have applyed that which follows unto our present prelatick party, had he seen our Church in this posture and in her present circumstances, viz. *we separat not from a true Church or her Lawfull Pastors, when we separat from hirelings and Idolshepherds, who will not go before us*, and whether he would not have thought and called Conformists so? Thus (page 148. concl. 6.) he tells us, *we may separat from the worship when we separat not from the Church*. So that its evident, that in Mr Rutherfoords sense we separat not from the Church of Scotland, nor her worship, while withdrawing from Curats, in attending the Ministry of Christs faithfull ambassadours.

In the Next place this *Informer* presents to us these passages further in that peice mentioned, viz. (page 233.) [the personal faults of others, are not sufficient ground for separation — That the disciples thought not the society unclean for Judas sin, though they

knew one of them had a Devil.] Again (page 250.) [It was not Lawfull to ſeparat from the Phariſees preaching truth.] (page 253.) [The Godly ſeparated not from the Church, when the altar of damaſcus was ſet up, things dedicat to Idols, as Lutheran images, are called Idolatry, 1 Cor 10. 34. Idolatry by participation, and the cup of devils, yet Paul commands not ſeparation, and the table of the Lord was there.] I anſwer, this is already removed by what is ſaid above, as to any concluſion for his cauſe, which this looſe diſputer doth not ſo much as offer to draw out upon theſe citations. 1. Unleſs he prove the Conforming party to be the true Church of Scotland, to which in this caſe we are obliged to adhere, or 2. If we can prove, that according to our Churches Reformation, Presbyterian miniſters and profeſſors are the true organick Church of Scotland, though the perſecute ſmaller number (which according to Mr Rutherfoord is very eaſy, for he ſayes that in caſe of defection, truth as life recools to the ſmaller hidden part, (*Due right page* 253.) In either caſe I ſay this will plead more appoſitly for adherence to Presbyterian Miniſters and their Aſſemblies.

Next, Mr Rutherfoords ſcope is to prove, *that perſonal faults corrupt not the worship*, which wee deny not, but as we have above cleared this falls utterly ſhort of reaching his concluſion, as to the owning of Curats, untill he firſt prove his forementioned ſuppoſitions, wherein he begs the queſtion, and this principle or aſſertion of Mr Rutherfoord will plead more ſtrongly for not diſowning Presbyterian Miniſters untill this *Informer* prove his ſuppoſitions, and diſprove ours in this debate.

In a word, the impertinency of all his citations here appears in this, that there is no reaſon whereby he can ward of this argument its reaching adherence to Presby-

Presbyterian Miniſters, and inferring a concluſion of owning them, but it will either, firſt be retorted upon himſelf, or ſecondly, the univerſality of the argument, and the concluſion deduced there from, ſo limited, as utterly to irritat his deſign; ſince he muſt acknowledge, that there may be a Lawfull ſeparation from a Miniſtry and ordinances, altho not polluted by perſonal ſcandals. And therefore this principle in every caſe will not infer a ſeparation to be unlawfull, far leſs a *non union*, and he muſt acknowledge that to argue the unlawfulneſs of a ſeparation or non-union in every caſe, or meerly, from this ground [that there is no pollution of ordinances by the perſonal faults of Worſhipers or adminiſtrators thereof] is a groſs *petitio principii & ignoratio elenchi*; and which his caſe, ſuppoſeth many things which are to be proved, as 1. That Conformiſts are this Church. 2. That this practice of diſowning them as now circumſtantiat, is properly a ſinfull ſeparation. 3. That Prelatiſts have the beſt right to officiat as Miniſters in this Church. 4. That we have no other reaſons for a non-union but this pretended pollution of ordinances, and that we ſtand obliged upon this ſuppoſition that the ordinances are not thus polluted, to joyn to them rather then Presbyterian Miniſters. And ſince this principle will prove them all to be Schiſmaticks who diſowne Presbyterian Miniſters in preaching the Goſpel, it will follow therefrom that our *Informer* is in this pamphlet pleading for *Schiſm*, or elſe he muſt ſo limit this poſition, as thereby his concluſion againſt us ſhall be utterly cut off as is ſaid.

Fourthly, he preſents unto us that paſſage (page 254.) where he ſhews [That the godly in England tho ſeparating from Biſhops and Ceremonies did not ſeparat from that Church; and approves their doing ſo, and in keeping communion therwith

in unqueſtionable duties, the contrary whereof he charges upon theſe ſeparatiſts againſt whom he reaſoneth, telling us *ibidem*, that if a Church be incorrigible in a wicked converſation, and yet retain the true faith, its to be preſumed that God hath ſome there to be ſaved, —— that Chriſt himſelf is where his ordinances are, and ſome union with him the head — that though a privat ſcandalous brother ought to be caſt off, yet not an Orthodox Chuch.] *Anſ.* 1. The Presbyterians have all this to plead for pleoples adherence to them, untill this *Informer* prove that the prelatick party are our nationall organick Church, which will be *ad Kalendas Græcas*. 2. Mr Rutherfoord all along ſtates his queſtion as to ſeparation, from a *Church ſo and ſo polluted*. Ergo he ſpaks not of *a ſchiſmatick deſtroying Innovating party*, or a ſeparation from them rather ſthen a ſound Church contending againſt them, which would quite invert his ſcope and arguing, and the ground and *hypotheſis* thereof. For I poſe this man what if a party of acknowledged Innovators caſt out the true Miniſtry, and ſhould plead this paſſage of Mr Rutherfoords for their ſchiſm and the peoples adherence to them, ſure he would charge them with begging the queſtion, as we do Conformiſts in this point, and would acknowledge that Mr Rutherfoord pleads nothing for them.

Fiftly, Mr Rutherfoord ſayes *ibidem*[We may ſeparat from the Lords ſupper where the bread is ador'd—— and from baptiſm where the ſign of the croſs is — yet we are not to ſeparat from the Church.] *Anſ.* We may hence collect that in Mr Rutherfoords principles 1. We are to ſeparat from all *contagious Worship*, tho not abſolutly corrupt. 2. That this is no ſeparation *from the Church* while there is a purer Church & Miniſtry to be joyned with, and to which we were joynd. 3. That *a fortiori* a non-union unto, and diſowning of a backſliding party,

ty, *who are not our Church*, is warrantable becauſe of their contagious corruptions, eſpecially when (as is ſaid) the oppoſition of that party to the true Church is ſo virulent. Mr Rutherfoord tells us there, that we ſeparat not from the Church when we profeſs to *hear the word*, and allow *the truth of Doctrine*, and do not Presbyterian profeſſors owne the true Doctrine of our Reformed Church, while hearing and and adhering unto her faithfull Paſtors. Beſide, Mr Rutherfoord tells us, that there may be cauſe of non-union where there is not ſufficient cauſe of ſeparation, as Paul ſeparat not from the Jews till they blaſphemed, yet, ſaith he, there was no cauſe why people ſhould joyn to that Church before that time, ſince they had the cleaner to joyn with viz. That of the Apoſtles ——— Ergo in caſe of a true Reformed Church her being divided, and rent by a backſliding deſtroying party oppoſing her Authority, union and purity, introducing Innovations into her, contrary to her Reformation and vows, and caſting out her faithfull Miniſtry who dare not comply with their wicked courſe, a non-union to them and adherence rather to that faithfull Miniſtry contending againſt them, is no ſinfull ſeparation from the Church, nor a ſeparation at all by Mr Rutherfoords doctrine. Sure the Presbyterian party are in our principles the cleaneſt Church, to whom therefore Mr Rutherfoords allows to adhere. (page 253.)

But here the *Informer* preſents us another paſſage in that ſame place to repell what is ſaid, viz. that he aſſerts [there is no juſt cauſe to leave a leſs clean Church (if true) and to go to a purer, though one who is a member of no Church may joyn to that which he conceives pureſt.] *Anſ.* This makes as little for him as any of the reſt, for 1. He is ſtill ſpeaking of a Church, thus intirely leſs pure, in compariſon of a

more pure. But bleſſed be God their prelatick impurity, has not infected all our Church, their being 1000 of Miniſters & profeſſors who adhere to the truth. This man will not ſay that this will plead for a peoples adherence to a party of Schiſmatick backſliders Intruding upon a pure Church, Introducing Innovations into her, and ejecting her faithfull Miniſtry as Conformiſts are now doing; which will be yet more convincingly clear, if we conſider 2. that Mr Rutherfoord layes much weight upon this, that a *man is already a member of that Church which is leſs pure*, but we cannot be ſaid to be *hactenus* members of, and on this ground under a prior obligation of adherence unto, a party of Innovators and backſliders, who are deſtroying and ruining the pure Church, but in this caſe our prior obligation is in order to adherence to that pure Church and her faithfull Miniſtry, thus oppoſed as is ſaid.

But now at laſt our *Informer* who hath been hitherto ſilent as to any inference from his citations, drawes out a general concluſion from them, *that in Mr Rutherfoords Judgment and the Engliſh divines, neither the perſonal faults of Miniſters, Nor real faults about the Worſhip (much leſs ſuppoſed only) will warrand a ſeparation*, which when admitted lifts not his cauſe one hair breadth off the duſt, as is clear from what is ſaid; ſince he hath proved none of theſe three, either 1. That they are the Church of Scotland to which we are bound to adhere according to the tenour and principles of our Reformation, nor 2. That this practice of diſowning them in this our caſe, is a ſinfull ſeparation. Or 3. that we diſowne them meerly for perſonal ſcandals, or ſome corruption in Worſhip. Whereas we have proved that abſtracting from both theſe, we have ground of diſowning them as *Schiſmatick Innovators* deſtroying this Church; and himſelf muſt grant that there

may

may be a non-union unto, yea a ſeparation from *a party ground leſly aſſuming the name of a Church*, though neither their perſonal faults do pollute the worſhip, nor the worſhip it ſelf be *ſimpliciter* diſowned, or elſe he muſt yeeld the cauſe when this is pleaded in behalf of Presbyterian Miniſters, and for not ſeparating from them: ſince it is upon this ground, that all along he pleads for people's diſowning them, though he dare not ſay that the ordinances are polluted by their ſuppoſed ſcandals.

After this our *Informer* exhorts his Doubter, *to try all things* ——— *and not to be aſhamed to retract what is amiſs, as Auguſtin wrote books of retractions, and Jerom exhorted Ruffinus not to be aſhamed to confeſs an error. Ans.* I think indeed, we are to ſearch all things by the rule of the word, and had he with a ſingle heart and an eye to the God of truth, ſearched better, he had not obtruded upon Gods people (in defence of ſo bad a cauſe) ſuch inſignificant arguments for demonſtrations. But why exhorted he not his Doubter *to hold faſt what is good*, as well as to try all things? It is not fit to be ever learning, and fixe in nothing. And no doubt this latter part of that ſcripture precept, juſtifies our oppoſing their Innovations. But he pleads for *retractions*, and its no wonder to ſee men who have Juſtified the caſting aſide ſuch ſolemn Oaths and vows unto God, plead for *retractions*. But if he and his party retract not ſuch monſtrous retractions (the very naming whereof would have made Auguſtin and Jerom aſtoniſhed) the wo threarned againſt perjury, backſliding, & breach of Covenant is very near them. His concluding prayer that *God bleſs us with truth and peace*, is good, and heartily accorded, and ſurely when our Jeruſalem ſhall have this ſpiritual proſperity, peace, and truth (which this man pretends to pray for) withinher walls, prelats and their wofull train and corrupt principles, which

which have made ſuch ſad breaches in her walls, will be without them. And the proſperity of ſuch as love her, will ruine her enemies.

His Doubters Reſolution [*to hold faſt what is good* upon the proof of all things] makes up his lame advice. And having thus fortifyd the Knowledge of the *ſerious Doubter* in that which this man hath been *miſinforming* him about, and antidoted this poyſon, we pray that all the ſincere enquirers for truth, may hold it faſt againſt the times errors and defection. The character of *ſchiſm* preſented to us at the cloſe of the pamphlet, is verifyed in the party he pleads for: ſince their proud uſurpation of the name and authority of this Church, after they have thus rent and ſeparat from her, demonſtrats this their ſchiſm to be *ſuperbiæ proles*. And in their taking up ſuch groſſe unheard of principles anent Oaths, anent Magiſtracy &c. to maintain and uphold this uſurping hierarchy, they are like to fall under that other branch of the character of ſchiſm, that *male perſeverando fit hæreſis*. And becauſe of the corruptions which it is like to be more & more productive of, It may very probably become alſo *mater hæreſeos*. The Lord awake for judgement, and ſend a plentifull rain to water his inheritance, and revive his work in the admiſt of the years, and make his face to ſhine upon his ſanctuary in theſe lands, which is diſolat, for his names ſake.

AN

## Chap. VI.

## Animadverſions
Upon the

# PREFACE,
## And title Page.

HAveing thus examined what this new Caſuiſt hath offered in theſe Dialogues, we ſhall here ſubjoyn ſome Animadverſions upon the Preface prefixt to this pamplet (1.) His profeſt deſign is *to let people ſee the ſin and unwarrantableneſs of ſeparation as the Epidimicall deſeaſe of the time.* *Anſ.* I think indeed it is ſo. and upon whoſe ſide this ſeparation lyes, and who hath brought in this flood as he calls it, not ſince 78 but 621 hope may be now no doubt to the impartiall diſcerner. Its no ſtrange thing to ſee men charge upon others, that whereof themſelves are ſo eminently guilty, Papiſts call themſelves the only Catholicks and charge Proteſtant Churches with ſeparation, juſt as this man and his Innovating party deal with us, they only muſt be the Church of Scotland, and we the Schiſmaticks, though not many years agoe it would have been thought (I beleeve by many of theſe men themſelves) as ſtrange ane abſurditie and paradox, to term ſuch a party owning ſuch principles and practices as they now doe, the Church of Scotland, as to affirm that *nihil* was *aliquid*, *non ens*, *ens*, or that *Zenith* was in the ſituation and place of *Nadir*: ſuch ane intoxicating thing is backſliding and ſinfull ſelf love.

2. He

2. *He praiſes Magiſtrats in the bounds where he is, whoſe authority together with his mightie convictions* (forſooth) *brought back people who went once to hear Presbyterian Miniſters out of noveltie. Anſ.* Its no ſmall peice of our ſin and deſolation that the Magiſtrats ſword given him for protection of the Lords faithfull Ambaſſadours in following theire duty, according to there ſolemn vowes to God, ſhould be improven in ſuch a ſinfull oppoſition to them. What peace and order in this Church hath attended their monſtrous perperjurious backſliding, were 20 years experience may diſcover eſpeciallie to thoſe who have ſeen and known the beautifull order of our firſt glorious temple, the verie rubbiſh, whereof is yet refreſhfull in any remains of a faithfull Miniſtrie that is left.

3. *Againſt his modeſt reluctancie* (forſooth) *ſome of authoritie and learning among his party thought it fitt that theſe his Dialogues ſhould ſee the light, becauſe ſchiſmatick principles and practices are not laid aſide but carried on and this* Informer *thou ht it a mater of conſcience to diſcover to ſuch as are willing to be informed, how unwarrantable ſuch courſ s are, if Scripure and even the Doct ine of Presbyterians may be admited to judge. Anſ.* How he hath faſtned this charge of *ſchiſmatick principles* and *practices* upon Presbyterian Miniſters and Profeſſors, I leave it to the Impartiall to Judge from what is here replyed. And how far any thing which he hath affered either from Scripture, or the principles of Presbyterians, is from reaching the concluſion which he aims at in theſe trifling Dialogues; which all who are conſcientious are (we hope) by this rejoynder, and a reſpect to truth and dutie, ſufficiently antidoted againſt, and the learned as well as conſcientious may wonder at ſuch prodigiouſly bold ignorance.

4. *He*

4. *He wonders that ſo many of good note and not of the commons only are drinking in the principles of Brouniſts, which have been zealouſly diſputed againſt by old nonconformiſts. Anſ.* How he hath made good this charge I refer it to the perſuſall of what is here replyed, and how far the pleadings of theſe Non-conformiſts whom he mentions are from helping his cauſe. I muſt here add, that its aſtoniniſhing to find this man pretending a *principle of conſcience* for this undertaking, when his conſcience could not but tell him, that both upon the poynt of Epiſcopacie, the Covenants, and ſeparation alſo, he might have found all and more then he hath ſaid fully anſwered, and that he pitifully ſnakes away from our arguments & dar not propoſe them in there genuin ſtrength. Nay he doth not ſo much as offer fairly to ſtate the queſtion in any of theſe three great points which he pretends to inform us about, but confuſedly ſhufiles them up for his own advantadge. And upon the point of the Covenant obligation, he poorly followes the arguments of the *Seaſonable caſe*, and ſome hints from the Surveyer without ſo much as offring any return unto what the Apologiſt hath long ſince repelyd unto them. If this was conſcientious dealing let any Judge? and yet he is not aſhamed to tell the world, *that becauſe Epiſcopacie and the covenants are by people made the great grounds of ſeparating, there fore he premiſed his two dialogues concerning Epiſcopacie and the Covenants, to ſhew what a ſandy ground they are for ſeparation, if prelacie be found at leaſt Lawfull, and the Covenants in evry caſe not obligatorie*, whereas he hath offered nothing either to prove prelacie lawful, or the Covenant not obligatorie, but what is by ſeverall of the godly learned abundantly anſwered and fully bafled, ſevrall of which (viz. the *Apollogiſt*, and *jus divinum Miniſtery Anglican*, he ſeems to have had before him in writeing theſe Dialogues, and yet nather doth he touch the anſwers of the Apologiſt to his argu-

arguments anent the Covenant, nor dar he ſcan the pungent arguments of the London Miniſters againſt prelacie, and likwiſe there anſwers to ſevrall things which he has offered for it, and particularly there learned *Appendix* in the poynt of Antiquitie, which cuts the ſinnews of all his tedious legend of teſtimonies, he durſt not medle with. Beſide it wold ſeem he hath ſeen Smectymnus upon this ſubject, whoſe learned confutation of the Epiſcopall plea as well from ſcripture as antiquity he paſſes over *ſicco pede*. And as for Eraſtian prelacie, he offers not a jot in defence of it, though his conſcience could tell him that this is one main poynt of our plea againſt him. So that ſuppoſe Epiſcopacie were *in its ſelf found Lawfull*, as he ſayes, yet if Eraſtian Epiſcopacie be found unlawfull, his cauſe and pleading is lame and loſt.

After this he would amuſe his reader with a teſtimonie of *Zanchie* and another of *Blondell* which parts the hoofs of his page firſt as for Zanchie he cites a paſſage of his *Obſer: in ſuam ipſius confeſſionem cap. 25. aphor:* 10. 11. wherein he ſayes firſt *his faith is ſimply built upon the word of God, Next In ſome meaſure upon the commun conſent of the antient Catholick Church, and that he beleeves what has been defyned by holy fathers gathered together in the name of the Lord —— citra ullam Scripturæ contradictionem that theſe things are from the Spirit of though not of the ſame authoritie with Scripture*, then he adds that *nothing is more certain from counſells Hiſtories and writeings of the Fathers then theſe orders of Miniſters of which he has been ſpeaking to have been received into the Church, with her intire conſent, and what is he to condemn what the whole Church has aproved.* I anſwer, beſide that he ſhould have ſet doun theſe *gradus Miniſtrorum* which Zanchius ſpeaks of, that his reader might have known what theſe degrees were, or whither they were prelatick degrees or not, which no doubt he would have done had he not found that this

this would have marred his intent, (for which cauſe he doth not ſo much as offer to Engliſh any part of this or of the enſuing teſtimony) we ſay, firſt, that any who knowes Zanchies learning, and what the voice of the firſt and pure antiquity is, and how far from giving a teſtimony to the preſent *Dioceſian*, much leſs the *Eraſtian* prelat, of whom none can without extrem impudence aſſert that Zanchie is ſpeaking, will eſteem this perſwaſion [that the prelacy now exiſtant with us hath the univerſall conſent of all hiſtories councills and fathers] to be as far from the thoughts of Zanchie, as its neceſſary to prove his poynt 2. Zanchiſe ayes his faith ſimply and mainly leans upon *the word of God*, and ſo whatever the word is found to condemn (as we have proved it doth the preſent prelacie in many reſpects) Zanchie will make no bones to condemn it likwiſe, own it who will.

The next paſſage he cites is of *Blondell* (*Apoll. pag.* 193.) who aſſerts that *τακτικον belongs abſolutly to the government of the Church —— and its anext υπηρετικον to the maner & order of its government, which the Church alwayes thought permitted to her arbitrement; Nather muſt we think every thing unlawful which humane cuſtom of profeſſors hath brought into the uſe of divine things --- That in ſuch things chriſtian prudence muſt act its part, that no Church muſt be drawen into ane example, that from the generall precept 1 Cor. 14: 40 the Church hath full power to follow what is more decent and commodious.* *Anſ.* 1. We have before cleard that with Blondell their *dioceſian Prelat* ſtands abſolutly condemned in ſcripture, and in his principles is diametrally oppoſit to the *divine Scripture Biſhop*, which evidently concludes his condemning the preſent Epiſcopacie with ſole power of ordination and Juriſdiction, — much more the Eraſtian prelat, altering fundamentally the go-

vernment it ſelf, which he dar not ſay that Blondell ever dreamed of. So that though we ſhould grant becauſe of this teſtimonie, that Blondell will befound to admitt a πρεσβυτερος and conſtant Moderator, which Its well knowen is the outmoſt length he goes, and that the Churches example and practice here anent may be variable, it falls utterly ſhort of reaching the leſt patrociny to his cauſe. 2. he cites 1 Cor 14. 40. anent alterable circumſtances of order and decency, about which the Churches exerciſe of Chriſtian prudence is converſant, ſo that he muſt underſtand what he pleads for to be of that nature, but we have ſhewed upon the firſt Dialogue how far its contrary to Scripture & reaſon to include a dioceſian Biſhop or Arch-biſhop within the compaſs of decencie and order there commanded, ſince decencie and order points only at circumſtances of actions already commanded and circumſtances commun to civil and ſacred things. And this according to the generall rules of the word, ſo that none can think Blondell ſo ſottiſh as to take in among theſe, the Dioceſian or Eraſtian Biſhop and Arch-Biſhop. 3. Since the profeſt ſcope of Blondells learned Appology is to plead for *ſententia Hieronomi* ——— which is that in Apoſtolick times *communi concilio presbyterorum Eccleſiæ gubernabantur*, ſurely whatever Blondell may admitt as to the Churches libertie in relation to a πρεσβυτερος, yet the admiſſion of the dioceſian prelate with ſole power of ordination and Juriſdiction (which this man pleads for) and much more the Eraſtian prelate, would evert both his hypotheſis and ſcope. Again, he dare not deny that with Blondell the επισκοπη is the Miniſteriall ſcripturall επισκοπη or Presbyterat, ſo that what he calls the *modus rei* cannot in its ſelf, (and conſequently in Blondells meaning) be ſuppoſed ſuch a *modus rei* as deſtroyes the thing it ſelf, & the ſubject which

it

it affects, as certainly by the Dioceſian *επισκοπη*, much more the Eraſtian, doth the very ſubſtantialls of Preſbyters divine power, which this learned author is in that piece pleading for. And in a word I dare poſe this *Informer*, whither Blondell would not have thought a national Churches liberty in this point of Cuſtome or alterable circumſtances of decencie and order (even tho we ſhould grant that he puts Epiſcopacy among theſe) is tyed up and reſtrained, by ſacred ſolemn Oaths and vowes univerſally taken on againſt the ſame; ſo that his cauſe is never a whit bettered by theſe blind Teſtimonies which (as is ſaid) he he durſt not tranſlate, as he profeſſeth to doe in the reſt of his citations, for the advantage of the unlearned.

The aſſertion after ſubjovned by him *viz. that the unlawfulneſs of Epiſcopacie was queſtioned by none of the ancients except Aerius, and rarely by any of the modern except ſome of our British divines, that antient and modern divines think that prelacie was the primitive Government left by the Apoſtles*] we have proved to be a manifeſt untruth. Specially when applyed to the prelacy exiſtant with us; and that it is the conſentient judgment of the far greateſt part, both of ancient and modern that there is no difference *jure divino* betwixt a Biſhop and Preſbyter. And that our Prelats now in Scotland are as far different from the antient Biſhops as eaſt from Weſt, ſo that no patrocinie can be drawen from the one to the other. That Blondell profeſſes to vindicat Jerom from that which he calls *Aerianiſm*, who will believe, taking Aerius opinion to be for the premiſed Identitie of Biſhop and Presbyter; ſince we have made it appear by Teſtimonies of the learned, that both Greek and Latine Fathers held this ſame opinion with Aerius. How he hath proved Epiſcopacie [*to be the*

*Government which hath beſt warrand in the word, and hath continued without interruption for many years*] we refer it to the reader to judge by what is above replyed, wherein we have made it appear, that as his pretended Scripture proofs for prelacy, and his anſwers to our Arguments againſt it, are moſt frivolous, ſo none of his pretended Teſtimonies from antiquitie doe reach his concluſion, nor any ſhadow of a patrocinie for our preſent Prelat now eſtabliſhed, whom we have fully diſproved from Scripture, both in his dioceſian and Eraſtian mould. What poor ſhaddowes for proofs doth this man graſp at Blondell thought the Scripture σπουδη lawful, and its υπεροχη to belong to συνταξις and good order. Ergo, he pleaded for the Dioceſian Biſhop with ſole power of ordination and Juriſdiction, and a Biſhop deriving all his power from the civil Magiſtrat as immediatly ſubject unto him, which is a very antilogical proof and a meer rop of ſand.

Laſtly he mainly commends to his reader this Dialogue anent ſeparation [*wherein he ſayes all the reaſons brought for it are propounded and anſwered without paſſion which doth but alienat the minds. Anſ.* How poorly this man hath anſwered the true grounds of diſowning conformitis, or rather paſt them over, and howpitifully he all along begs the queſtion in ſuppoſing what he hath to prove, we hope is made ſufficiently appear to the Judicious and impartiall. As for paſſion, its true there is leſs of this in his Pamphlet then in ſome other of this ſtamp which his fellowes have flung out among the people, yet he hath his ſignal flaſhes of it [*in Juſtifying Dr Burnets parallel of nonconformiſts with Scribes and Phariſees, and in calling them as great and cauſeleſs Schiſmaticks as ever the Church had in any age*, nay in his groſſe malitious reflecting upon the ſufferings of poor Innocents in this land, telling us under the covert of

of Cyprians words [ *that their inexpiable ſin of diſcord is not purged by their ſufferings* ——— *that forſaking Chriſtes Church, they cannot be martyres nor reign with him,* ] which, with what a tincture of malice it preſents its ſelf, let any judge. His conferences he ſayes do bring water to quench our flames, but they bring rather fewel to the fire, and wood and hay to uphold Babell. The Rabbies whom he pleads for have kindled our flames, and the beſt way to quench them Is to put theſe incendiaries to the door.

Next he cites the preface of the *Syntag. Confeſs. edit. Genev.* [ *wherin the Church of Scotland is commended for her unity as well as purity of Doctrine,* and then he cryes out *O how have we loſt our good name, and the ſtaff of bonds is broken in the midſt of us* ] but he ſhould have been ſo ingenuous as to have told us that we are in the preface of that Syntagma commended for our *reformed Presbyterian diſcipline* as the great bond and cement of our unity, and the guard of our *pure doctrine*, and who have broken this bond and ſacred hedge I need not tell him, and what hath been the *diſtreſs, confuſion* and *deſolation* of our Church ſince it was broken, every one now ſees; ſo that he might lament the loſs of *our good name* upon this ground, and eſpecially of our Integrity where he a true ſon and watchmen of this Church. The conſequences of our ſad diviſions, through the violence and Schiſmatick intruſion of abjured perjured Prelats and their underlings have indeed hazarded the ſtanding of Chriſts Kingdome among us according to that of Mark 3.24. And the biting & devouring wolves, the Prelats for whom he pleads have hazarded the conſuming of Gods poor remnant Gal. 5. 19. Our Churches diſſolution & corruption, & were he as tender to prevent this, as to preſerve there worldly peace and ſinfull union, he would have ſeen Prelacy to be

the *Idol Iealouſie*, the wedge driven by the popiſh artiſans to divide and break this Church, and as the true cauſe of all our breaches to be removed in order to healing. The popiſh invaſion doth indeed plead for union of the true Proteſtant Church and intereſt againſt them, and conſequently to hold out and oppoſe ſuch arrant upholders and promoters of that Antichriſtian intereſt as Prelats have firſt and laſt been found and never more then now, ſince popry hath never more prevaild then ſince they were eſtabliſhed (by the confeſſion even of our Rulers) and that without control. While they are enflaming the powers to the out moſt height of rage againſt poor Innocent nonconformiſts, ſo that union with them who are at ſo palpable an union with Rome is not the unity of the ſpirit which is to be keep in the bond of Peace, and to be ownd by any that favour the Proteſtant Intereſt.

The texts which he preſents unto us upon the frontiſpeice of the Pamphlet will be found to rebound a deadly blow upon his cauſe. For that paſſage Pſal. 122. 6. 7. *pray for the peace of Ieruſalem &c.* We alſo pray for this peace, and in order to the obtaining of this ſuit, that the Lord would make up the breaches in her walls, and remove the treacherous breakers thereof, who, we may ſay again and again that in this they have *dealt very treacherouſly*, but what peace with Conformiſts while their whoordoms are ſo many. The next text is Pſal 133. 1. *behold how good and pleaſant a thing it is for brethren to duell together in unitie.* It is ſo indeed and therefore woe unto them (if they repent not) who have broken this bond of holy brotherhood, have rent Aarons garment, corrupted the Covenant of levi, and do avowedly owne principles and wayes upon which hermons dew (heavens bleſſing) cannot be

expe-

exſpected. Therefore this command of Lovely union engadges to disjoyn our ſelves from them. For the next text Mark 3. 24. *a kingdome divided againſt its ſelf cannot ſtand* &c. We ſay, Gods Church hath ſtood amidſt great diviſions, is one and intire in it ſelf, and will at laſt be delivered from all diviſions and offences; and therefore upon the ſame ground we are to avoid prelatiſts who have cauſed them. For that of heb 10. 25. anent *not forſaking the Aſſemblies*, we bleſſe the Lord that ſuch as are ſorrouſull for our Churches true Aſſemblies, and to whom this man and his fellowes reproaches thereof are a burthen, have had the Aſſemblies of Chriſts ambaſſadours to attend, and that the great Maſter of Aſſemblies hath not wholly left them, but hath covered a table in the wildernes in this our Churches flight unto it, to theſe who with perill of their life are ſeeking their ſoul food becauſe of the ſword of the wilderneſſe, drawen out by Aſſemblies of Schiſmatick deſtroying Intruders, from whom we muſt depart, and who have perſecut us away for adherance to our ſworn Reformation and Covenant with God, which they have diſſound.

The ſentence next ſubjoyned *viz. opinionum varietas & opinantium unitas non ſunt aſſectata*, doth highly reflect upon himſelf, and the party he pleads for, who doe perſecut with fire and ſword all who differ in judgement from them in theſe things which they aknowledge but *tricæ* & *maters indifferent*, ſo that in this they are *αυτοκατακριτοι*. For us, we are chaſed out from them, and can be admitted to no union with them except we unit in there ſin, which throw grace we are fixtly reſolved againſt. His deſign [*to quiet peoples minds, and ſetle them in more peace and unitie*] is of it ſelf to good to be preſented as a porch here to ſuch a ſhattered paſquill, and to be pretended to ſo bad a cauſe

and

& in this place may be not unſuitably aſſimilated to Solomons *ring of gold in a ſwines ſnout.* No doubt ſolid peace and unitie is only to be found in Gods way, in keeping his Covenant and owning his Meſſengers of peace (whoſe feet have been beautiful even on theſe reproached mountains & other places where Gods people aſſembled, ſince they have his call and ſeal to preach the goſpell) and not in following the foxes in a way of perjurie and breach of Covenant as this pamphleter would perſwad.

---

FINIS.

## Curteous Reader.

*There being ſeveral conſidarable Typographicall erroures in the firſt part eſpecially, thou art deſired ere thou readeſt, or in the reading to amend with thy pen theſe enſuing, or ſuch like as will occurr unto the in the peruſal.*

### Firſt Part.

PAg. 5. l. 15. read ἐπισκοποι. p. 6. l. 25. r. 28. l. 29. r. inequality. p. 8. l. 18. r. chides. p. 9. l. 2. r. juridical. l. 8. r. high. p. 10. l. 6. r. Paſtors. l. 16. r. dogmatick. l. 35. r. juridical. pag. 11. for [as the foundation of] r. influencing. p. 13. l. 30. r. this. p. 17. l. 6. r. διδακτικος. l. 24. r. poſeſſed. p. 18. l. 17. r. he. p. 19. l. 32. r. qualifications. p. 21. l. 7. r. hath. p. 22. l. 11. r. teil. l. 20. r. the. p. 25. l. 23. r. with. p. 26. l. 31. r. none. p. 27. l. 1. r. up. l. 7. r. theſe. p. 28. l. 24. r. unto. p. 29. l. 26. r. power. p. 31. l. 17. r. there. p. 32. l. 32. r. it. p. 36. l. 26. r. worn. p. 37. l. 9. r. bring. p. 39. l. 13. r. he. p. 12. p. 46. l. 23. r. Rom. 12. p. 51. l. 1. r. Gravari. l. 2. r. Politicorum. Chap. 7. Tit. l. 5. add. in. p. 59. l. 10. r. wearing. l. 16. add. a. l. ult. r. not. p. 63. l. 9. r. Oeconomy. l. ult. add. ſhewes. p. 68. l. 7. r. ſimply l. 33. r. to. p. 73. l. 22. r. be. p. 76. l. 9. add. is. p. 81. l. 10. r. ſubject. l. 30. r. of dominion. p. 82. l. 25. r. Informes. p. 84. l. 1. r. negatively. p. 85. l. 9. r. his. p. 86. l. ult. r. the. p. 89. l. 13. r. ἐπισκοπην. So. p. 92. l. 4. - l. 32. r. can. p. 94. l. 33. r. in. p. 95. l. 1. dele. is. p. 96. l. 4. r. he. p. 99. l. 27. add. is. p. 102. l. 10 for. [the Corinthians] r. Churches. p. 104. l. 13. dele, [as we may after ſhew] 107. l. penult. r. officers and offices. p. 108. l. 30. r. can. p. 109. l. 9. add,

his.

his. p. 114. l. 10. r. thus. l. 32. add. no. p. 116. l. 11. add, according to the ſeries of his reaſoning. no. p 119. l. 9. r. this. l. 29. r. inferiour. p. 120. l. 30. r. this. p. 123. l. 4. r. Chriſtian. p. 124. l. 9. r. to gather. l. 30. dele ry. p. 125. l. 24. r. been. p. 126. l. 22. r. Spurious. p. 129. l. 1. r. commanded. l. 4. r. Presbytry. p. 131. l. 13. ſupple. in the proper Scriptural ſenc. l. 32. r. grad. p. 137. l. 1. dele. had ane office next to that of apoſtles and doctours. p. 139. l. 20. r. his. p. 140. l. 21. r. for. p. 148. l. 12. r. ſupple. Taking it in ane authoritative Juridical ſenc. p. 150. l. penult. r. pray. p. 157. l. 14. dele, apoſtolik and. p. 162. l. 27. r. circle ſtil. p. 163. l. 9. r. with. l. ult. r. ceremonial. ibid. r. part. p. 164. l. 31. r. ἐπισκοπῶντες. ibid. dele. ane. p. 167. l. 5. r exemplify. p. 170. l. 14. r. Prov. 9. p. 171. l. 14. r labourers. l. ult. add. wee. p. 174. l. 34. r. ὑμῖν p. 177. l. 10. r. ubi. p. 177. l. 31. for, even, r. except. p. 178. l. 2. r. πρεσβυτερίῳ. p. 183. l. 30. Ar. it ſelf. p. 186. l. 16. r. and pride. l. penult. add, in. p. 188. l. ult. r. true. p. 191. l. 30. r. profligat. p. 195. l. 16. r. interval, the, l. 21. r. nothing. p. 196. l. 3. r. bold. p. 198. p. 199. l. 5. r. what. p. 200. l. 2. dele meſſage, or. l. 13. add. in. p. 201. l. 33, p. ſuppoſitia. l. 33, r. ſuppoſitious. l. ult. what. p. 203, l. 17. r. till. 204. l. 6. r. conſuetudo. p. 206. l. 24. r. for, l. p. 211. l. 21. through the. p. 215. l. 25. r. diſtributively. 217. l. 9, dele, by. l. 19. add, is. p. 219. l. 6. r. or. p. 221. l. 24, add, the. l. 25. r. oppoſed. p. 222. l. 25. r. of. p. 226, r. ἀναβιβάσαι. 227, l. 12, r. ἐπισκοπῆς. p. 229. l. 24. r. deligatur plebe p. 231, l. 30. r. ligandi. l. ult. in. p. 236 l. 11. r. eorum. p. 238, l. 26. r. ſit ſegregatus. l. 27. r. ſet aſide or ceſured. p. 241, l. 20. r. ἐπέρας διδάξαι. l. 25, r. διδακτικὸν. p. 142, l. 10. r. lowly. p, 143. l. 10. r. unalterablenes. l. 19, r. harmonious p. 245, l. 7. r. commune p. 246. l. 28. r. name. p. 247. l. 28. r. office. ibid. r. none. l. 30, r. us. p. 252. l. 3. r. 5. l. 33. ſupple, and beſides. l. 34, r. this.

ibid.

ibid. ſupple, which is p. 261. l. 28. r. forgat. 29. r. for. p. 261. l. 26. r. πεφθχμεροιωθυλς: p. 265. l. 10. dele, as to ſoom acts. p. 272. l. 6. r. πολλῆς p. 281. l. 9. r. πρεσβυτέριον.

2. Part. pag 2. l. 15. ſupple. both. p. 7. l. 24. ſupple, anno 40. and 41. p. 24. l. 17. r. 1671. p. 62. l. 4. r. this p. 73. l. 2. r. then l. 20. r. cannot. p. 99. l. 18. r. commiſſaries p. 117. l. 4. dele. me. p. 124. l. 4. r. conſonant. p. 132. l. 19. r. Diæceſeos. l. 21. ſupple. the.

Part. 3. Pag. 2. l. 13. r. our. l. 14. r. or. p. 4. l. 29. r. declared p. 12. l. 13. ſupple. and are. p. 14. l. 28. r. doe. p. 26, l. 15, ſupple. ane. p. 28, l. 28, r. and. p. 29, l. 16, r. of. p. 35, l. 31, ſupple. ὁ σωτηρος l. 32, r. δύναμις. p. 36, l. 1, r. motion. p. 37, l. 28, r: fourth. p. 39, l. 32, r. conſtitution. p. 40, l. 32, ſupple comparing this with what he pleads from the inſtance of Solomons depoſing Abiathar. p. 48, l. 9, r. by. p. 53, l. 2, r. obligations, p. 59, l. 8, r. intruſion. p. 61, l. 32, add. therof. p. 64, l. 27, r chouſing. p. 67, l. 15, r. petitio. p. 69, l. 25, r. they. p. 73, l. 32, r. καθισάναι. ἀρχην p. 78, l ult. r. Sabinus. p. 81, l. 15, r. the p. 83, l. penult r. relation, p. 84, l. 15, r. no Biſhop. p. 90, l. 21. r. Prieſt. l. 27; dele. hearing of. p. 28, dele. and attending their Miniſtry as ſuch 15. p. 94, l. 11, ladde, graceleſs men. p. 95, l. 4, dele. of. p. 103, l. 18, r. of l. 23, r ſcruple. p. 113, l. 1, r. ſupremacy. p. 127, l. 28, r. inquies. p. 130, l. ult. r. calceorum. p. 134, l. 12, r. another, p. 138, l. 26, r. authority. l. penult. r. our. p. 160, l. 1, add. this. p. 162, l. 27, r. Presbyterian. p. 165, l. 17, r. they. p. 167, l. 27, r. for, or, r. againe, p. 168, l. 1, adde, eſpecially. p. 170, l. 10, r. which notwithſtanding is: 179, l. 29, r. Magiſtrats: p. 181, l. 12. r. a purer Church. p. 183, l. 16, r. and which doth. p. 186, l. 2, r. thouſandes. l. 16, r. this. p. 190, l. 11, r. more then. l. 28, r. offered. p 162, l. 8, r. Smectymnuus. p. p, 162, l. 25, r. the Holy Spirit, dele of ibid. p. pe-

nult.

ault. r. the preſent eraſtian hierarchical degrees. p. 103 l. 12, r. zanchy ſayes p. 165. l. 1. dele, by. p. 196, p. 22, dele the. p. 197, l. 7, r. build. p. 198, l. 4, add our l. 12, r. utmoſt: p. 199, l. penult. r. too. In the contents, part. 1, cap. 7. l. 10. dele ad. cap. 8, l. 8, adde is. p. 6, l. 21, r: Theodoret. l. 31, for, rulers, r. rules. So l. 32, p. 7, l. 4, r. poor ground l. 14, r. of. p. 11, l. 6, their point, r. the point. p. 14, l. 6. r inconſiſtencies. l: 8. for and r: which p. 17. l: 7 r: ownd: p: 18: l: 23 dele is p. 19. l: 19: to the hearing of them. r. to the hearing of Curats.

In the Preface p. 3, l. 22, r. the world. p. 6: l. 1, r. ſweet. in ſoom copies. p. 8, l. 6, the ſhold, r. threſhold. l. 7, dut. r. duſt. in ſoom copies. p. 9, l. ult. and p. 10, l. 1, wanting, ſo to be ſupplyed [conſequenly in all other debeats in theology, nay, we muſt meaſur the temple,] p. 10, l. 20, for ager r. anger. p. 20, l. 4. r Scripturs. l. 25, for, [antiquity Churches and the practice] r. antiquity and the Churches practice. p. 23, l. 21, r. ſcarrcrow. p. 26, l, 19, ſhattered. p. 29, l. 17, r. lapp. p, 32, l: 1: for a: r: be, 18, r. at al. p. 34, l. 21, r. Texts. p. 35, l. 19, for [this] r. thus. l. 22, for wher r. for. p. 32, l. 5. for, polites, r poliſhed. p. 41, l. 12. for, above r. here l. penult. plead for it. r. for this. p. 42, l. 2, r. limite it l. 5, but beating. r. but a beating. l. 11, for, add: r and: p. 45. l. 3 ſhattered. l. 17, for, perſual, r peruſal. p. 46, l. 24. dele, and. p. 46. l. 19. for, ſhepherd Iſrael, r, of Iſrael. l. 30: dele of.

*Others of leſs importance, ſuch as the deficiency, redundancy, or miſplacing, either of vowels, conſonants, or ſoom ſillables; or the dificiency, redundancy, or miſplacing of commaes, colous, or the like points, thou may amend as thou readeſt. The pages that are wrong figurd, or the numbers of ſome chapters in the firſt part, thou will find corrected, in the index, and fixt in due order. If any errours of more importance occurr, the candid reader is deſird to pardon the ſame; and amend them in reading.*

# ADVERTISEMENT.

*Reader*,

Having upon further view of this impreſſion found that the bad moold of ſome Sentences, and ſeveral other ommiſſions of the tranſcriber, have crept into the ſame, I have thought fit to fill up ſome pages with theſe notes enſueing, to be added unto the ERRATA.

PAG. 7. l. 2. r. Miniſters. p. 5. l. 29. r. The Prelate is the proper immediat ſubject of the power of both order and jurisdiction, and hath the exerciſe thereof properly and immediatly intruſted to him. p. 11. l. 16, 17, 18. r. They are made therein rulers, Governours, Overſeers, Paſtors and Stewards in the Church, which Scripture epithets (and the power therein conſequently imported) our adverſaries will not for ſhame deny to be competent to preaching Presbyters. p. 16. l. 12. r. hence it follows that he &c. p. 18. l. 22. r. his practice in the exerciſe of his power. p. 20. l. 14. r. The Schoolmen with ſome ancients. p. 25. l. 17. r. and that their formal office, at leaſt as importing a ſingular power in ordination & Government, over Paſtors.

P. 66. l. penult. r. denying abſolutely and without any reſtriction, the neceſſity of what is commanded only under ſome general head. p. 71. l. 6. after Miniſters, adde (an ampliation and inſtance very unſuteable to the firſt general aſſertion.) l. 10. r. general head of decencie and order. p. 72. l. 4. r. muſt be warranted upon another principle and ground then this l. 10. r. whether he muſt not have a clear Scripture inſtitution, and fall within the compaſs of a

command. p. 76. l. 19. After *Ambition*, r. The text being moſt expreſſe in it, that the inequality which they were ſtriveing about, included a dominion and primacie. p. 77. l. 13. after [touched] adde, ſince our Lord was now exerciſeing, an abſolute ſupremacie over his Church, how then (I pray) will this argument taken from his example, Suite his Scope & purpoſe of diſchargeing a Supremacie. p. 79. l. 20. 21. r. thus, did not Chriſt diſcharge ane inequality, in diſchargeing a primacie; an inequality of the higheſt pitch. p. 79: l. ult: r. Seeming to make. p. 80. l. ult. After [power] adde (to uſe his way of ſpeaking) p: 81. l: 20: r. and neither deſpotick nor princely. p. 83. l. 28, 29. r. That Church-officers are of ſuperiour or inferiour orders or kinds. p. 84. l: 26. r. A preaching Presbyter or Paſtor. l. 31, 32. r. Such Presbyters have the Scriptural Epiſcopal authority. p, 85, l. 17, r. Superiour and inferiour kindes or orders. p. 87. l. 6, r. After [Church rulers] adde, we, all know how Prelatiſts and the popiſh Church apply Κλῆρος or Clerus. l. 9. after [denomination] adde, conſidered in its true extent & import, p. 89. l. 5. r. To the higheſt ordinary office beaters, intruſted with the Power of the keys, l. 14, r. Whatever Power of order or juriſdiction, the Scripture Biſhop can lay claime unto. p. 90, l. 1. r. The Scripture Epiſcopal Power, l. 9: r. All this Epiſcopal Authority. l. 25, r. Elders or Biſhops in a perfect parity, and in common, So. l. ult. after [flocks]. p. 91. l. 3. after, [Presbyters] adde, when applyed (as is ſaid) to the higheſt ordinary officers entruſted with the Power of the keyes, l: 12, r. preaching Presbyters or Paſtors. So l. 18, l. 32. after [elder] adde (he muſt underſtand the preaching elder or Paſtor if he ſpeak to the point.) l. ult. and pag. 92. l. 1. r. When God is pointing out thereby the higheſt ordinary officer intruſted

truſted with the word and doctrine. l. 5. r. preaching Presbyter, l. 15, r. preaching elders. l. 17. r. this higheſt ordinary ſtanding officer often mentioned, p. 92. l. 17. r. When the Word [Biſhop] is applyed to the higheſt ordinary Church officer entruſted with the Power of the keyes. l. 24. r. preaching elder or Presbyter, l. 30. r. the ſame higheſt ordinary officer. l. 37. r. preaching Presbyter, So p. 94. l. 5, and 7. and 19.. So p. 95, l. 5, & 9. p. 97. l. 5, r. preaching Presbyters or Paſtors. So, l. ult. and p. 99. l. 4, & 16, 26. So p. 101, l. 14, and 18. l. 34. r. that the Paſtoral office admitts of different orders, p. 102, l. 28. r. preaching Presbyters. So. p. 103, l. 6. 21, and 28. So alſo, p. 104. l. 23. p. 111, l. 30, r. Such different orders of Church officers, l. 34. r. different orders, p. 120. l. 14. r. his fancied Eccleſiaſtick Officers ſpecifically different. p. 122, l. 8, r. of a Superiour order and function, l. 11, r. of the ſame function. l. 16, r. Several functions, l. 18, r. different functions. p. 124, l. 24. r. as appearing to the *Informer* Epiſcopal like. p. 131. l. 13. r. thus (or of the Scripture ſenſe imbraced by our divines, viz. for the Apoſtles extraordinary unfixt aſſiſtants in their Miniſtry. So Calvin on the place. Bucan, loc. 47. de Miniſt., Muſculus, loc. de miniſt. verb. pag. 362. &c. and the latter part of his Anſwer ſeems to admitt this) l. 21. r. (which the *Informer* will eaſily grant is not that ſtrict proper ſenſe of the Evangeliſt, ſuppoſed either in his doubters objection or his anſwer.) p. 133. l. 31, 32, 33. r. Thus, in the Scripture proper ſenſe, but thoſe that preach the Goſpel in that extraordinary way above expreſt, for, as for thoſe that wrote the Goſpel, the *Informer* will not ſay they are intended here, and although ſuch may be in part called Evangeliſts upon this ground, as *Marks*, & *Luk*, *Senſu Auguſtiore*, as Bucan expreſſeth it, *ubi ſupra*, yet this

is not acknowledged to be the proper and adequate ground of his office and denomination, as contradistinguished in Scripture from Apostles, two Apostles themselves, *Matthew* and *John*, being such Evangelists, p. 139, l. 33, 34. r. So that he doth in these words clearly plead &c. l. ult unto p. 140. l: 6. after [among them] adde, if we consider the intire Series of his reasoning, not only from Christs primacy and Supremacy as exemplified in the Apostles (whatever he doth inconsistently here adde, as to the division of this princehood among them, since thus the Apostle John was sole primate, over the Church when the rest were gone) but also from the morall standing Authority of the Jewish Priesthood, and such a single Supremacy of the High-Priest which he denyes to be typicall, but of constant use in Government, and his expres asserting that *equality of the same Ministry, may admit of inequality* (consequently principality, or primacy as he expresseth it) *in Government*. Thus he [de divers. grad. cap. 14. pag. 145.] l. 16. r. Had in a prefect parity and in common; so pag. 147. l 13. p. 148. l. 31. after *elder*, adde, taking it in an authoritative juridical sense, as competent to Church officers. p, 149. l. 13. after *accuse*, adde, taken generally and in its full latitude. p. 152. l. 21. After *properly*, adde, and immediatly intrusted to them. p. 157. l. 12. r. will the Informer deny that in his sense, or of these divines, these precepts, 1 Tim. 6: 13. and 1 Tim. 5. 21. Joyned with the promise mentioned, will not reach, and include every peice of the Apostolick and Evangelistick office *respective*, p: 158. l. 10. r. is not that which simply and absolutely in it self considered they hold to have the force of a rule, p. 162. line 10. r. different offices and functions, 25: r. before Ephesus Crete and other Churches were settled in their organick being and

and their ordinary and inferour elders. p. 164. l. 13. r. is mentioned in such ane act of Solemn blessing, thus circumstantiate both as to its subject and object as this. p. 176. (misprinted 149.) r. From the first Scripture Bishops or preaching Presbyters, p. 177. l. 30, 31. r. That this Episcopal power over Presbyters, though farre from the Diocesian Bishops power was not till the year 140. p. 190. l. 18. r. Aaron himself [mediatly at least and upon the matter.] p. 194 l. 12. r. Hammer p. 197. l. 13. r and expound thy Scriptures which custome hath not known &c. Disowning thus all customary or traditionall innovations. p. 200. l. 27. r. from Mark the Presbyters, l. 29. r. speaking of this custome he excludes him. p. 201. l. 2. r. thus, to the Presbyters election as their act simply, but would have plainely asserted that it was by Mark's appointment: *the simple observing of this practice or custome*, & observing it by *his appointment*, being quite distinct things; beside that we shall after shew, that Jerom never intended to assert any such thing. p. 203. l. 16. r. The Church in this Nation. p. 207. l. 7. r. Common counsell, or in a joint parity and equality, so, l. 15. ibidem after. 4 figure, r. if in Jerom's sense the Apostles &c p. 208. l. 3. r. preaching Presbyters. From, l. 11: to 17. r. thus, can he make it appear that the Schisme in Corinth (from which he drawes the change in Jeroms sense) was anterior to his proofs from. 1 Pet. 5. and Acts. 20. Much more his proof from John, for the divine warrand of this intire parity and common joynt Government of Presbyters, or that this Schisme was not attended with such absence of the Apostle, as he supposes did influence this new Episcopall Government in Jeroms sense. p. 209. l. 1. After the word [*nature*] adde, besides that the passage it self will never prove either Marks practice or appointment in relation to this supposed Bishop as is said, p. 211. l. 11. r. Upon

pon the ground of this firſt evaſion and gloſſe, l. 20 r, which in the two collated paſſages of Jerome, 212 l. 5. r. that the Apoſtles in Jeroms ſenſe did, l, 24. r. by common counſel, or in a compleat parity, (thus alſo. p. 214, l. 24) p. 213. l. 22, r. preaching Preſbyters, p. 216, l. 29, 30, to 32, after [Jerome ſpeaks of] r, thus. So that this Schiſme was bred while there was no Presbyterian parity to breed it. He tells us, that in Jeroms ſenſe the Corinth Schiſme gave a riſe to this change, while Paul was preſent in Spirit and Governing them Epiſcopally (for he will not ſay that he let go his reighns of Government upon every perſonal abſence) and therefore it took its original according to his pleading from the Apoſtolick Epiſcopacie. p. 220, from l. 33, to p. 221, r. he makes him reflect upon Chriſts immediate commands and inſtitutions in point of Government, whereof ſeverals can be produced in the Evangelick Hiſtory, as if they were not only altered, but ſtated in oppoſition to the Apoſtles inſtitutions and practice therein. For Jerom doth thus clearly oppoſe to one another, the *Diſpoſitio Divina*, and *Eccleſiæ uſus* or cuſtome in this paſſage, as two contrary and inconſiſtent things, thus he alſo reflects upon Chriſts inſtitutions as at firſt practiſed by the Apoſtles before this change. p. 225. l. 17. r. no ſuch delegation. p. 231. l. 17. r. the preſent prince-like power of our Prelates, as Dioceſian B. farre leſs their Eraſtian uſurpations. p. 237, l. 8, 9, &c. r. the ancient Biſhops were not all ſett over whole provinces, but city by city for the moſt part (yea ſeveral cities had more) who certainly were not Biſhops in that ſenſe, wherein we heard Theodoret and Oecomenius denyes a multiplicity of Biſhops in one city, which alſo proves a great variety in the Moold and denomination of Biſhops ſpoken of by the fathers. p. 238. l. 23, r. ſett aſide, ſeparat, and ſuſpended

ded, So, p. 239, l. 2, p. 247, l. 11, r. a preaching Presbyter or Paſtor. l. 35, r. Sect. II. p. 250. l. 9. muſt begin thus. Beſides, what can he inferre from Calvin's aſſertion of the precedency of one at that tyme? had not Paul &c. p. 251, the Parentheſis l. 5, 6, 7. r. thus (no leſſe fooliſhly then maliciouſly here improven by Durel, no friend to his principles.) p. 252, the penult line muſt be contiguous with the preceeding, and run thus, beſids that this treatiſe intituled &c. p. 258, l. 15, and l. 19, of pag. 259 are to be joyned as contiguous, p. 261. l. 17. after [Government,] adde, and received and ſubmitted to our Churches pure conſtitution in point of doctrine and worſhip, p. 262, l. 25, r. which as early crept into the Church; as the prelacy he pleads for yea much more early. p. 263, l. 33, 34, 35, r: thus; nor hath the *Informer* proved that this Proeſtos, caſt in the moold of the preſent Epiſcopacie which he pleads for, was allowed of Blondel, ſince he holds it to be croſs to the divine pattern, and from Scripture diſputes againſt it. p. 238, l. 21, r. from the tymes of the Apoſtles, and appointed by them. p. 262, from, l. 22, to l. 29 r. thus: preſented under an Epiſcopal notion to Euſebius, and the Power of Biſhops which then had obtained, whom he too credulouſly following in his Character and accounts of them, and (as Irenæus alſo doth) calling them Biſhops in the Catalogues, might deceive others in nameing them, ſo, p. 263, from, l. 9, to 11, read, what ever impreſſion of them Irenæus might be ſuppoſed to have upon the ground of his expreſſions of them, or might thereby beget in others, becauſe of the language and cuſtome of their time, yet &c. from l. 14, to 16, r. the nature, and ſtate of theſe Church-officers, whom termeing [Biſhops] they were ſuppoſed to be ſuch as had then obtained, l. 18, to 25. r.

thus; in that Irenæus calls them [ Presbyters ] according to the promiſcuous uſe of the names *Biſhop* and *Presbyter* in his tyme, they prove that theſe expreſſions of them which ſeem to favour of an Epiſcopal notion, or what impreſſion he might have, or others take from him, was a miſtake: ſince according to the Scripture language &c. l. 26, to 32, r. that what impreſſion Irenæus might poſſibly have of the firſt moderators, or what Epiſcopal notion Euſebius might preſent them under, upon his credulous reports taken up upon truſt (as he ſayes himſelf) from his forefathers, were a miſtake: and this becauſe the perſones, whom they thus repreſented, and of whom they meaned and ſpeake, were upon the matter *meer Preſbyters*- p. 264, l. 21, r. next, if the *Informer* will ſtrain theſe words to plead for his hierarchie even in the Apoſtles tyme, and will affirme that Bucer &c. l. 25, r. he muſt needs grant that Bucer was obleidged to take notice &c. l. 30, r. els there will be no conſiſtencie in the words, if Bucer reckon &c. p. 271, l. 5, 6, r. but as the *Informer* will finde it hard to prove this diſtinction of the ſchools to be as ancient as theſe fathers, ſo though it were granted that it was, it is certain that what gradual difference they admitt betwixt the Biſhop and Presbyter, they found it &c. p. 281, l. 3, r. collected by one under the name of Clemens. 2d. Part. p. 5, l. 1, r. haveing no tincture of Prelacie, but intirely Presbyterial in its mold & members, according to the then degrees and State of our Reformation. p. 23, l. 7. after [ Seaſonable caſe ] r. (and himſelf in objecting the ſame afterward, p. 69.) p 29, l. 8, r. in their nature, and originally flowes from the Pope, p. 64, l. 30, after [Government] adde, whatever defection or liberty of gloſſing any of them might fall into or plead for. p. 76, l. penult. read. præl. 3, parag. 9. p. 78, l. 3, r. of all Oaths of this nature.

nature. p. 82, l. 3, 4, 5, r. Not to detain the *Informer* in tasking him to prove that this Statute as not being judicial, but moral, doth belong unto the Chriſtian Church: l. 28, 29, r. this divine frame of Presbyterian Government, which both as to its courts and officers, comprehends the ſubſtantials of Government: p. 83, l. 15, r. præl. 3, parag. 9, 10, l. 23, r. præl. 7, Parag. 6: p. 92, l. 27, r. but ſuch cannot be the *Informers* meaning in this place, nor will his moold of arguing admitt thereof: p. 98, l. 14 r. a matter not only of it ſelf indifferent, but a domeſtick and private concerne l. 22, after [*gratis dicta*] r. Beſides, upon the ſuppoſal that the matter of both Oaths is alike or equal, and that the matter of the Covenant is indifferent, the parallel will not hold as to a diſpenſation with the matter of the one and the other. p. 101, l. 11, after [obligation] adde, for whither we conclude the lawfulneſs of the matter of this Oath, from its conformity to the divine poſitive Law, or from the overruling of this poſitive precept in this caſe by a Superiour moral command, all is one as to our defence and argument for the Covenant from this text, p. 115, l. 18, r. The *Informer* hath not reconciled this either with the command or with the promiſe &c. p. 117, l. 15; 6, 7, r. Sure in his opinion their offer of a league, if ſtrangers, admitted a demurr, and if Canaanites their offering to admitt of terms of peace might have ſtopt this queſtion, even though inhabitants of Canaan &c. l. 11, r. So their firſt offer was a ground of peace, if ſtrangers, l. 13, r. eſpecially theſe continued demurrs and renewed interrogatures recorded in this contexture are conſiderable, if we conſider what is obſerved by learned interpreters from v. 8. that they ſought peace, &c. l. 17, and when, r. for when. Par.. 3. p. 35, l32, r. ὁ προεστὼς ὅση δύναμις ἀντιτείνει p. 45, l. 28, r.

Presbyterian Government and the eſtabliſht Reformation of this Church, p. 47, l. 28, r. the work of the Reformation then eſtabliſht, p. 50, l. 3. for, pamphlet r. Dialogue: p. 54, l. ult. r. and ſuch things as upon our, and the Scripture grounds (which the *Informer* cannot diſprove) do immediatly in a moral ſenſe diſpoſe &c: p: 56, l: 33, r: (beſides that as to the maine of this Character, they are all ſuch as we have cleared) he makes &c: p: 57, l: 14, r: which even as to the Apoſtle himſelf, was ſolemnly ſealed, confirmed and commended to the gentile Church: p. 73, l. 10, r. extending hands, and that not only among the people, but alſo in commitiis &c. p. 75, l. 27, r. independents and us in this point of a miniſterial call. p. 76, l. 8 r. that this electiv ſuffrage ſtrictly taken or juridicially, may be pleaded for as belonging to them. p. 77, l. 8, 9, &c. r: thus: and as that which is proper to ſome part of this organick body (the Church) may in a General ſenſe be ſaid to be the due right of the Church it ſelf: in like manner, may this call and election be ſaid to be the right of the wholl congregation, as including the body of the people and the elderſhip, the *juridical deciſive ſuffrage* belonging to the elderſhip, and the *Conſentient* to the reſt of the people, as is ſaid. p. 18, l: 9, r. they are abjured, p. 90, l: 17, 18, r. againe, 'tis obedience that is enjoyned, which is more General and extenſive then hearing them as Eccleſiaſtick officers, and will not neceſſarily include it, l. 20, 21, r. ſitting in Moſes chaire who was King in Jeſurum, appears diſtinct from ſitting in Aarons Prieſtly chaire, p. 91, l. 10, 11. r. hence the conceſſion [that they were to be heard] will not bear a concluſion of hearing Curats, in this our caſe. For 1. (here adde what is under the ſecond head) then proceed thus, next, ſay they were

to

to be heard as Eccleſiaſtick teachers, the caſes are very different &c. then proceed to 1, 3, 4, 5. head. p. 97, l. 9, r. teach and expone in the ſenſe and extent he pleads for, which he hath not &c. p. 103. l. 29. 3. depending as to their ordination, p. 104. l. 24, r. did the miniſterial acts of our Reformers now mentioned flow &c. p. 105, l. 6. r. did owe the validitie of their Baptiſme, &c. p. 115. l. 27. after [defection] adde, and deeper ſtaine of more and more practical acknowledgements thereof, as to the deſigne and endeavours of the Law-makers, p. 118, l. 2. r. Since in this his firſt reply, taken from *their obedience to the rulers*, he touches neither the Antecedent nor conſequent &c. l. 30, 31, &c. r. thus, Since he acknowledges ſeparation from the Government to be Schiſme, Sure our counter charge ſtands good againſt him, that the firſt Separation lies at his Door, it being made good that Presbyterian Government is both *the Scripture Church Government*, and alſo the *reformed eſtabliſhed Government of this Church*, & this retorted charge, neither he nor any of his party are able to diſprove. For &c. p. 119. l. 30. r. abſolute unavoidable condition: p. 128, l. 33. r. that are very neceſſary, *but allures him rather by love and tender forbearance*: p. 119, l. 6. r. ——— *Sed licentia, quod temeritatis, & ſuperbiæ & ſtultitiæ* (in margine *arrrogantiæ*) *majoris videbatur*. p. 130, l. 18, r. but I ſay not (ſayth he) the Idolothyt &c. p. 131. l. 10, r. thus, at that tyme this came to paſs through their weakneſs, &c. p. 133, l. 10. r. that in theſe things he will rather cede from his liberty (or intermit its exerciſe) then offend &c. p. 141. l. 33, r. no more indifferent, but duty, p. 142, l. 15, r. takeing this phraſe in a moral ſenſe, and in the Scripture acceptation. p, 150, l. 16, 17, after [Miniſtry] adde, and did neceſſa-

ceſſarily ſuppoſe the ſame: p: 155. l. penult. r. Ergo. by his Magiſtratical Power, he did properly and immediatly ſilence and depoſe him, and the civil Magiſtrate may thus immediatly and formally by his Magiſtratical Power reſtraine the exerciſe of the miniſtrie. p. 157, l. 2. r. that he can by his Magiſtratical Power and by elicit acts immediatly reſtrain miniſterial duties, or that the Magiſtrate hath ane immediate Power over the exerciſe of the Miniſterial office, to diſcharge it at his pleaſure. p. 164, l. 14, r. r one anent whom an inquiry might be ſtated.

Præf. p. 24. l. 24. r. contention and hatred. p. 26. l. 6. r. come to Bethel. p. 35. l. 16. r. after the firſt tranent view which I had of it.

*Several ſuch might poſſibly beyet gleaned up: if ſome paſſages of Authors ſeem to generaly cited, or not tranſlated* ad verbum, *the notoriety of the places themſelves may excuſe the firſt, and the condition of Readers, to whom this is mainly addreſſed, may plead for the ſecond. The Pages here quoted are numbred according the printed Method, but the true Method exhibit in the Index, will direct the Reader aright.*